

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE



Bulletin

MIAMI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Vol. XXXVII, No. 961

November 25, 1957

SCIENCE IN NATIONAL SECURITY • *Address by President Eisenhower* 819

SECRETARY DULLES' NEWS CONFERENCE OF
NOVEMBER 5 824

NEW DIMENSIONS IN DIPLOMACY • *by Under Secretary Herter* 831

UNESCO: ONE ROAD TO PEACE • *by Assistant Secretary Berding* 835

PROGRESS UNDER THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON
TARIFFS AND TRADE • *Statement by Assistant Secretary Mann* 846

UNITED STATES POLICY IN THE FAR EAST • *by Deputy Assistant Secretary Jones* 840

For index see inside back cover

THE
OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
OF
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XXXVII, No. 961 • PUBLICATION 6561

November 25, 1957

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:

52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Science in National Security

*Address by President Eisenhower*¹

My subject tonight is "Science in National Security."

Originally this talk was to be part of one I intend to make in Oklahoma City next week. However, I found that I could not possibly deal with this subject in just one address. So tonight I shall concentrate on the most immediate aspects of this question of the relationship of science to the defenses of our country.

First, let me tell you plainly what I am going to do in this talk and in my next.

I am going to lay the facts before you—the rough with the smooth. Some of these security facts are reassuring; others are not—they are sternly demanding. Some require that we resolutely continue lines of action now well begun. Others require new action, and still others, new dimensions of effort. After putting these facts and requirements before you, I shall propose a program of action—a program that will demand the energetic support of not just the Government but every American, if we are to make it successful.

Facts About Security

First, then, some facts about our present security posture. It is one of great strength, but by no means should this assurance satisfy any of us. Our defenses must be adequate not just today but tomorrow and in all the years to come, until under the safety of these defenses we shall have secured a durable and just peace for all the world.

As of now the United States is strong. Our nation has today, and has had for some years, enough power in its strategic retaliatory forces to

bring near annihilation to the warmaking capabilities of any country.

This position of present strength did not come about by accident. The Korean war had the effect of greatly expanding our peacetime defense forces. As we began the partial demobilization of those forces, we undertook also an accelerated program of modernization. As a first step, scientific surveys were instituted soon after the Korean armistice. The result was a decision to give a "new look" to the defense establishment, depending for increased efficiency more upon modern science and less upon mere numbers of men.

In succeeding years there has been an across-the-board program to bring all units of our defense into line with the possibilities of modern technology. There has been, also, a high level of expenditure on research and development for defense—now running in the aggregate at something over \$5 billion a year.

Other scientific surveys following the first one focused attention and emphasis on long-range ballistic missiles. Development on these particular missiles got into high gear more than 2 years ago. We have since been spending a billion dollars a year on this item alone.

Now, before discussing some of the things we urgently need to do, I would like to give you a few samples of the things that have been done in recent years by our military forces, scientists, and engineers to put current scientific discovery at the service of your defense.

In our diversified family of missiles we have weapons adapted to every kind of distance, launching, and use. There are now 38 different types either in operation or under development. And almost one-third of these are in actual operation.

¹Delivered to the Nation over radio and television on Nov. 7 (White House press release).

All combat vessels of the Navy built since 1955 have guided missiles in place of, or to supplement, guns. The Navy has in both oceans submarines which can rise to the surface and launch, in a matter of minutes, a missile carrying a nuclear warhead and submerge immediately, while the missile itself is guided to a target hundreds of miles away.

The Navy possesses atomic depth bombs.

Since Korea both the Army's and Navy's anti-aircraft guns have been largely replaced by surface-to-air missiles. All of our new interceptor aircraft are armed with air-to-air missiles.

Many of the traditional functions of the Army's artillery and support aircraft have been taken over by guided missiles. For example, we have already produced, in various distance ranges, hundreds of Matador, Honest John, and Corporal missiles. To give you some idea of what this means in terms of explosive power: four battalions of Corporal missiles alone are equivalent in fire power to all the artillery used in World War II on all fronts.

Some of these missiles have their own built-in mechanisms for seeking out and destroying a target many miles away. Thus, the other day a Bomarc missile, by itself, sought out a fast-moving, unmanned airplane 45 miles at sea and actually met it head-on.

Except for a dwindling number of B-36's, there is hardly an airplane in the combat units of the Air Force that was in them even as late as the Korean war. The B-52 jet bomber, supported by its jet tankers, is standard in our Strategic Air Command. Again, to show you what this means in terms of power: one B-52 can carry as much destructive capacity as was delivered by all the bombers in all the years of World War II combined. But the B-52 will, in turn, be succeeded by the B-58, a supersonic bomber.

Atomic submarines have been developed. One ran almost 16 days recently without surfacing; another cruised under the polar icecap for 5 days.

A number of huge naval carriers are in operation, supplied with the most powerful nuclear weapons and bombers of great range to deliver them. Construction has started which will produce a carrier to be driven by atomic power.

Since 1956 we have developed nuclear explosives with radioactive fallout of less than 4 percent of the fallout of previously built weapons.

This has obvious importance in developing nuclear defenses for use over our own territory.

In numbers, our stock of nuclear weapons is so large and so rapidly growing that we have been able safely to disperse it to positions assuring its instant availability against attack and still keep strong reserves. Our scientists assure me that we are well ahead of the Soviets in the nuclear field, both in quantity and in quality. We intend to stay ahead.

We have already shown that we can, with the precision to make it a useful military weapon, fire a large ballistic missile well over a thousand miles. Ballistic test missiles have had successful flights to as much as 3,500 miles. An intercontinental missile is required, and we have some of them in an advanced state of development. But, because of our many forward positions, some of them in the lands of our allies, an intermediate-range missile is as good for us as an intercontinental one.

A different kind of missile, the air-breathing Snark, recently traveled over a guided course for 5,000 miles and was accurately placed on target.

We have fired three rockets to heights between 2,000 and 4,000 miles and have received back much valuable information about outer space.

One difficult obstacle on the way to producing a useful long-range weapon is that of bringing a missile back from outer space without its burning up like a meteor because of friction with the earth's atmosphere. Our scientists and engineers have solved that problem. This object here in my office is the nose cone of an experimental missile fired over a long distance. It has been hundreds of miles into outer space and back. Here it is, completely unharmed, intact.

These illustrations, which are of course only a small sample of our scientists' accomplishments, I give you merely to show that our strength is not static but is constantly moving forward with technological improvement.

Long-range ballistic missiles, as they exist today, do not cancel the destructive and deterrent power of our Strategic Air Force.

Earth Satellites

The Soviet launching of earth satellites is an achievement of the first importance, and the scientists who brought it about deserve full credit and recognition. Already, useful new facts on

outer sp
the way
are laun
Earth
present
ever, th
launchi
liely.
the adv
military
powerf
But i
trate o
and sup
political
serves
have n
the Sov
Finlan
Korea,
suppre
Eter
militar
and sp
to the
selves
and ex
well-be
We
buildin
attack
no def
in pre
weapo
To a
nershi
a cont
out in
this
proach
warni
compu
missil
ganiza
prove
be inc
Nov
defens
groun
world
varior

outer space have been produced, and more are on the way as new satellites with added instruments are launched.

Earth satellites, in themselves, have no direct present effect upon the Nation's security. However, there is real military significance to these launchings, as I have previously mentioned publicly. Their current military significance lies in the advanced techniques and the competence in military technology they imply—for example, the powerful propulsion equipment necessarily used.

But in the main the Soviets continue to concentrate on the development of warmaking weapons and supporting industries. This, as well as their political attitude in all international affairs, serves to warn us that Soviet expansionist aims have not changed. The world has not forgotten the Soviet military invasions of such countries as Finland and Poland, their support of the war in Korea, or their use of force in their ruthless suppression of Hungarian freedom.

Eternal vigilance and increased free-world military power, backed by our combined economic and spiritual strength, provide the only answer to these threats until the Soviet leaders themselves cease to consume their resources in military and expansionist purposes and turn them to the well-being of their own peoples.

We frankly recognize that the Soviets are building up types of power that could, if we were attacked, damage us seriously. This is because no defensive system today can possibly be airtight in preventing all breakthroughs of planes and weapons.

To aid in protecting against this, we, in partnership with Canada, have long been constructing a continental defense system reaching from far out in the Pacific, around the northern edge of this continent, and across the Atlantic approaches. This is a complex system of early-warning radars, communication lines, electronic computers, supersonic aircraft, and ground-to-air missiles, some with atomic warheads. This organization and equipment is under constant improvement; emphasis on this improvement must be increased.

Now, in addition to retaliatory and continental defense forces, we and our allies maintain strong ground and naval units in strategic areas of the world. In the strength and readiness of all these various kinds of power—retaliatory, defensive,

and local—properly distributed and supported, lies the real deterrent to the outbreak of war. This fact brings home to all of us the tremendous importance to this country of our allies. Not only do they maintain large military forces as part of our combined security, but they provide vital bases and areas that permit the effective deployment of all our forces for defense.

It is my conviction, supported by trusted scientific and military advisers, that, although the Soviets are quite likely ahead in some missile and special areas and are obviously ahead of us in satellite development, as of today the overall military strength of the free world is distinctly greater than that of the Communist countries.

We must see to it that whatever advantages they have are temporary only.

The Future

Now the next question is: How about the future?

I must say to you in all gravity that, in spite of both the present overall strength and the forward momentum of our defense, it is entirely possible that in the years ahead we could fall behind. I repeat: We could fall behind, unless we now face up to certain pressing requirements and set out to meet them promptly.

I address myself now to this problem knowing that for every American it surmounts any divisive influence among us of whatever kind. It reminds us once again that, when our security is involved, we are not partisans of any kind—we are Americans! We will close ranks as Americans and get on with the job to be done.

According to my scientific friends, one of our greatest and most glaring deficiencies is the failure of us in this country to give high enough priority to scientific education and to the place of science in our national life. Of course, these scientists, in making that judgment, properly assume that we shall continue to acquire the most modern weapons in adequate numbers as fast as they are produced; but their conviction does expose one great future danger that no amount of money or resources currently devoted to it can fully meet. Education requires time, incentive, and skilled teachers.

They believe that a second critical need is that of giving higher priority, both public and private, to basic research.

As to these long-range requirements, I shall have something to say next week. Tonight I shall discuss two other factors, on which prompt action is possible.

The first is the tragic failure to secure the great benefits that would flow from mutual sharing of appropriate scientific information and effort among friendly countries.

Most great scientific advances of the world have been the product of free international exchange of ideas. There is hardly a nation that has not made some significant contribution to modern science. There instantly comes to mind the contribution of Britain to jet propulsion, radar, and infrared rays; Germany to rocketry, X-rays, and sulfa drugs; Italy to wireless telegraphy; France to radioactivity; and Japan to magnetics.

In the free world we all have a lot to give and a lot to gain in security through the pooling of scientific effort. Why should we deny to our friends information that we are sure the Soviets already have—information our friends could use toward our common security? Why, for want of the fullest practicable sharing, should we waste American research funds and talent struggling with technological problems already mastered by our friends?

Here is one way in which, at no cost, we can dramatically and quickly magnify the scientific resources at the disposal of the free world.

The second immediate requirement is that of greater concentration of effort and improved arrangements within the Government in the fields of science, technology, and missiles—including the continuing requirement for the closest kind of executive-legislative cooperation.

Actions Taken

As to action: I report the following items to you tonight.

The first thing I have done is to make sure that the very best thought and advice that the scientific community can supply, heretofore provided to me on an informal basis, is now fully organized and formalized so that no gap can occur. The purpose is to make it possible for me, personally, whenever there appears to be any unnecessary delay in our development system, to act promptly and decisively.

To that end I have created a new office called the office of Special Assistant to the President for

Science and Technology. This man, who will be aided by a staff of scientists and a strong advisory group of outstanding experts reporting to him and to me, will have the active responsibility of helping me follow through on the program of scientific improvement of our defenses.

I am glad to be able to tell you that this position has been accepted by Dr. James R. Killian, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a man who holds my confidence and enjoys the confidence of his colleagues in the scientific and engineering world and in the Government.

Through him I intend to be assured that the entire program is carried forward in closely integrated fashion. He will help to see that such things as alleged interservice competition or insufficient use of overtime shall not be allowed to create even the suspicion of harm to our scientific and development program. Moreover, Dr. Killian will see to it that those projects which experts judge have the highest potential shall advance with the utmost possible speed. He will make sure that our best talent and the full necessary resources are applied on certain high-priority top-secret items which, for security reasons, I know you will not expect me to enumerate.

In looking to Dr. Killian to discharge these responsibilities, I know that he will draw upon the full abilities of the scientists and engineers of our country. And let me say that our scientists and engineers, in offering their services to the Government in this field, have been generous, patriotic, and prompt.

Second: In the Defense Department is an official, directly responsible to the Secretary, in charge of missile development. I have directed that the Secretary make certain that the Guided Missile Director is clothed with all the authority that the Secretary himself possesses in this field. Dr. Killian will, of course, work intimately with this official.

Third: The Secretary of Defense and I have agreed that any new missile or related program hereafter originated will, whenever practicable, be put under a single manager and administered without regard to the separate services.

Fourth: There will be laid before the Congress proposed legislation to remove legal barriers to the exchange of appropriate technological information with friendly countries.

Fifth shall reached millan, NATO research-able of

These coming Congre every action. both s leaders alacrity

These that an upon s Ever the en question Accord to a nu security Likewise for gr mand enable time a

In t nothing is exp afford

It n now in tary h heed c person tainly But th charg once.

2 But

Nov

Fifth: If the necessary authority is granted, I shall support, along the lines of the agreement reached recently with Prime Minister Macmillan,² a scientific committee organized within NATO to carry out an enlarged Atlantic effort in research. Similar action in SEATO and comparable organizations will be studied.

These matters will be discussed in my forthcoming bipartisan meeting with the leaders of Congress. They will be requested to consider every feasible step to hasten needed legislative action. I should like to report to you that on both sides of the aisle down in Congress the leaders have accepted my invitation to come with alacrity and with good will.

These, my friends, are the most immediate steps that are under way in scientific areas as they bear upon security.

Even in two talks I cannot, by any means, cover the entire subject of defense but only selected questions of pressing and current importance. Accordingly, I am not at this time even alluding to a number of key items bearing strongly on our security, such as mutual aid and civil defense. Likewise I have not dwelt upon the urgent need for greater dispersal in the Strategic Air Command or for providing all the means that will enable airplanes to take off in the shortest possible time after receipt of warning.

In this whole effort it is important to see that nothing is wasted on nonessentials. Defense today is expensive and becoming more so. We cannot afford waste.

It misses the whole point to say that we must now increase our expenditures on all kinds of military hardware and defense—as, for example, to heed demands recently made that we restore all personnel cuts made in the armed forces. Certainly we need to feel a high sense of urgency. But this does not mean that we should mount our charger and try to ride off in all directions at once.

We must clearly identify the exact and critical needs that have to be met. We must then apply our resources at that point as fully as the need demands. This means selectivity in national expenditures of all kinds. We cannot, on an unlimited scale, have both what we must have and what we would like to have.

We can have a sound defense and the sound economy on which it rests—if we set our priorities and stick to them and if each of us is ready to carry his own share of the burden willingly and without complaint.

In conclusion: Although for tonight's purposes I stress the influence of science on defense, I am not forgetting that there is much more to science than its function in strengthening our defense and much more to our defense than the part played by science. The peaceful contributions of science—to healing, to enriching life, to freeing the spirit—these are the most important products of the conquest of nature's secrets. And as to our security, the spiritual powers of a nation—its underlying religious faith, its self-reliance, its capacity for intelligent sacrifice—these are the most important stones in any defense structure.

Above all, let me say for all to hear: So far as we are concerned, the amassing of military might never has been—and never will be—devoted to any other end than defense and the preservation of a just peace.

What the world needs today, even more than a giant leap into outer space, is a giant step toward peace. Time and again we have demonstrated our eagerness to take such a step. As a start in this direction I urge the Soviets now to align themselves with the practical and workable disarmament proposals approved yesterday by a large majority in the United Nations.

Never shall we cease to hope and work for the coming of the day when enduring peace will take these military burdens from the backs of men and when the scientist can give his full attention, not to human destruction, but to human happiness and betterment.

² BULLETIN of Nov. 11, 1957, p. 739.

Secretary Dulles' News Conference of November 5

Press release 617 dated November 5

Mr. White [Lincoln White, chief of the News Division]: Ladies and gentlemen, may I have your attention please. The Secretary will be down in just a moment or two. I would like to make a little announcement right at the outset; that is, we would appreciate it if the questioner would identify himself by name and by paper.

Q. Why, Linc?

Mr. White: As is the custom at the White House.

Q. Why, Linc?

Mr. White: It is just more manageable for us, and I would think for you too.

Q. Is this a permanent thing, Linc?

Mr. White: Pardon?

Q. Is this going to be permanent from now on?

Mr. White: Yes, we would appreciate it.

Secretary Dulles: I have no statement of my own to make, so if you have questions—

Mr. Lisagor: Mr. Secretary, I am Pete Lisagor of the Chicago Daily News. (Laughter) Can you tell us why you want us to identify ourselves and our papers? (Laughter)

A. I was told that that was a practice that prevailed at the White House and that the correspondents seemed to like to get their name in the papers and they might like it over here. (Laughter)

Mr. Roberts: Mr. Secretary, my name is Roberts, and I work for the Washington Post. I would like to raise a point: that this question, as far as a rapid survey here developed, has never been raised with the State Department Correspondents' Association, and I think it properly should be before we get into this. It is rather a

precedent-shattering thing for Cabinet members to start.

A. Well, I didn't realize there was so much modesty here. But, in view of what you say, we will waive the business for today and have it discussed before my next press conference.

Q. That's good.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I think that's a very welcome decision on your part. Our feeling had been that this whole procedure slows down the conferences and formalizes them quite a bit, and I would be happy to have it reconsidered.

A. Yes.

Q. I would like to ask you, sir, what you think about the Soviet withdrawal from the Disarmament Commission and Subcommittee in the United Nations.

A. Well, there has been no withdrawal. There has been a statement that they did not consider that it would be useful to continue the negotiations within the framework of the Disarmament Commission and the Subcommittee as now constituted. That's apparently designed to threaten or pressure the General Assembly into adopting a form of resolution that the Soviet desires. It has been urging, as you know, and I think it has submitted a resolution calling for a continuance of these discussions within the framework of the total membership of the United Nations, that is, 82 nations. It looks as though they were trying to put the pressure on to compel the adoption of that procedure, which is the one which they have always favored. That means that it becomes a propaganda performance rather than a negotiation. I would doubt very much whether this threat would lead to the adoption of the preferred Soviet procedure. But I haven't had any recent reports from the General Assembly as to what the impact of the Soviet statement has been.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you feel in the light of what has happened in the smaller body, the Disarmament Subcommittee, it is really worth while the West continuing to refuse to negotiate in the larger body, since the Russians appear to take a propaganda position in the smaller body too? And it presumably alienates some of the nations which are left out.

A. It is quite impossible to negotiate in a body of 82. You speak of negotiating with 82 nations—that is an utter impossibility. If you want to negotiate, you have got to negotiate in a small body primarily between the principal parties and interests. The Soviet proposal would certainly not in any way advance the cause of disarmament, so far as I can see. Now these talks in the Disarmament Subcommittee did achieve a very considerable progress in at least narrowing the differences and developing a considerable acceptance in principle of certain ideas. In the application of those principles there was some considerable difference, and whether or not that is an unbridgeable gap, I don't know. But I am quite confident that the gap will not be bridged by attempting to negotiate with 82 people.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you tell us, sir, what is the status of discussions in respect to the possibility of a nuclear-arms stockpile for NATO nations? And, in that connection, what can be done at the NATO conference in December apart from or within, let's say, the present statutes on the matter—American statutes?

A. There is being considerable consideration given to that problem. I have spoken of it here once or twice in the past. It was put forward as a French proposal at the last NATO meeting that was held in Bonn in May. We have been studying it very actively here, and I hope that by the time we get to the next NATO meeting in Paris in December it will be in shape for some concrete submission.

Now you ask what can be done within the present law. Quite a lot can be done within the present law. We have an acceptable arrangement with Canada within the present law. We have an arrangement programed with the United Kingdom dealing with intermediate missiles, which is within the compass of the present law. And while the present law in that respect is not wholly satisfactory, and while I do not exclude

the possibility of asking for amendments in that respect, nevertheless, I repeat, a good deal can be done within the compass of the present law.

Q. Mr. Secretary, since we last met, the Russians have launched a second Sputnik, complete with dog. And we had your views earlier as to what you thought the significance of their first one.¹ I was wondering, sir, if the fact that they have succeeded in sending aloft a satellite which is nearly half a ton in weight, and one which has the dog, whether this altered in any way our view as to the military significance of this.

A. I do not think that it alters our view, although I must say that I have not yet had a full report from our intelligence people or from the defense people who are the authorities in that matter—I am not. It seems to confirm what we inferred from the first satellite: that they do have a very considerable means of propulsion into the outer space. That tends to confirm that they have the capability to have an intercontinental missile. Now whether they have intercontinental missiles and, if so, how many, and whether they are in production or not, this is unrelated to the satellite nor does the satellite of itself bear upon the problem of reentry. However, we have no particular reason to question that there is the capability of reentry, although that is not demonstrated by the satellites.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you think this calls, or would call, in any way for a new look at our program?

A. Well, from what I read in the papers, I would think that our program is getting a new look.

Communism in Latin America

Q. Mr. Secretary, I would like to turn for a moment to inter-American relations. You probably were told yesterday that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has scheduled hearings in Washington on November 12 on communism in Latin America. This responded to a question by Senator Olin Johnston, who yesterday also made public a report according to which all of the Latin American countries but the Dominican Republic appeared to be in great danger of Communist

¹ BULLETIN of Nov. 4, 1957, p. 708.

infiltration. He also seems critical of the Government's action regarding the Dominican Republic and says it may respond to irresponsible revolutionary leftwing groups in New York and Miami. And I would like to read one paragraph; he says, "While a great part of our press at home is out conducting a crusade against the Dominican Republic, the greatest foe of communism in the Latin American area, it silently allows communism to move in on dozens of Latin American countries." I wonder if you could comment on that and see where we are remiss in our reporting.

A. Well, I wouldn't want to express an opinion about your reporting. I would say that while, of course, there are Communist efforts in every one of the American Republics, including our own, we do not take a grave view of the situation. I think the situation on the whole is very much better than it was prior to the Caracas declaration² and the overthrow of the government in Guatemala, which was dominated, at least, by Communists and derived support from Communist sources.

That is because the Caracas declaration declared that it would be a danger to the peace of America, and a matter of concern to all of the American Republics, if the political institutions of any one came under the control of international communism. That means that, if communism did get such control, there would be a joint effort to eradicate it. Therefore, the likelihood of such control surviving is quite small. And, while the Communist Parties are certainly making trouble and attempting to embarrass the governments in many of the Republics, we do not think that the situation is in any degree alarming, and we see no likelihood at the present time of communism getting into control of the political institutions of any of the American Republics.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you welcome this investigation? Do you think it's necessary?

A. Well, frankly, I just haven't looked into it enough to express an opinion. We are never adverse to having the facts brought to light with reference to any one of these situations, provided the process is, as I am sure this would be, a fair one and doesn't so absorb our time and effort that we are not able to do our daily tasks.

² For text, see *ibid.*, Apr. 26, 1954, p. 638.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on the question of outer space, there are a lot of rumors that the Russians are going to try to hit the moon and other bodies. Is there any American position on who owns outer space? Do we favor the idea of having the United Nations claim this area?

A. The proposal that we made in London to set up a group to study the utilization of outer space would, among other things, I think, deal with the problem which you raised. There is probably no law on this subject. There is a question as to how high up sovereignty extends. The Soviets have complained about intrusion into their outer space in terms, I think, of some balloons that were flying very, very high. They had not quite reached outer space but were pretty close to it. Of course, actually, there is no clear-cut line between inner space and outer space. It's such a gradual shifting of one or the other that one can't accurately delineate it. We felt that some of this experimentation through instruments in balloons, that we were carrying on largely in this country and in the Pacific to get data for weather purposes and the like, did not involve any illegal interference in the sovereignty of any country. The Soviets at that time took a contrary view. But they apparently think that, where their flights occur, it's all right; where ours occur, it's all wrong. I think that there will need to be some effort to establish law in this field, and that would be, perhaps, an outcome of this study that we proposed, if it were undertaken.

Controversy in Moscow

Q. Mr. Secretary, the latest developments in Moscow have been interpreted in some quarters as meaning an increase in Khrushchev's power. Would you give us your interpretation of this, as well as your views on the downgrading of Marshal Zhukov?

A. Certainly what has happened involves an exercise by Khrushchev of personal power. Whether that increases his power basically or not, or may in the end diminish it, only the future can tell.

As I suggested last week might be the case, it seems as though the controversy revolved primarily around the question of whether or not the military establishment, the Red army, would primarily serve the Russian state and be an instru-

ment of the nation or whether it would serve the Communist Party and its goals, which are far more worldwide than are the goals of the Soviet state.

There has constantly, as I pointed out last week, been pulling and hauling within the Soviet Union as to the precise degree of authority that the party exercised over the state. And it seems that Zhukov, perhaps, did not care to accept for the Red army the degree of control that Khrushchev wanted on behalf of the party through the introduction into the army of commissars and the like, who acted directly on behalf of the party and were not officials of the Soviet state.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you then regard the Soviet state and the Communist Party as two separable things, or are they inseparable as far as our concern goes?

A. Well, according to the doctrine, they are separate, and you can find plenty of writings of high authority within the Soviet Union which proclaim the doctrine of separateness. But, on the other hand, they also proclaim, as I think I have quoted Stalin as having said, that "no significant decision is ever taken by the state except under the guiding direction of the party." And it is through the party, for example, that there is brought about complete unity within what purports to be a Federal system. If you read the constitution of the Soviet Union, you will find that it is made up of Federal states, each of which, in theory, has independent authority. But their governments, the Federal governments, are all run primarily by one single entity, the Soviet Communist Party. And it is through the party controls and influence that the satellite governments are kept under control.

Now the party does not attempt to take all of the day-by-day decisions, the detailed decisions, but it does make all of the basic decisions. There is a distinction, and you can see that there is a distinction by the fact that this whole controversy about Zhukov revolves around the degree of separateness that there shall be of the military establishment from the party, and that Zhukov wanted to have a greater degree of separateness than apparently Khrushchev was willing to accept. Khrushchev in this case got his way.

Q. Mr. Secretary, a couple of weeks ago in a speech in California, your brother suggested, as

one possibility, the rise of a military dictatorship in the Soviet Union.³ That was before the Zhukov purge. How would you appraise that as a possibility now?

A. Well, it is quite possible that Khrushchev also saw that as a possibility and moved to forestall it.

Possibility of Military Unity

Q. Mr. Secretary, coming back to NATO, do you think it's possible to have an integrated military system without a political body on top?

A. It's obvious that the easiest way, in theory at least, to have that unity is through a political combination. That was the conclusion to which we came here in the early days when, after an experiment with the Confederation, an alliance between the 13 States, we decided it didn't work and therefore there was created the United States of America as a Federal political body in order, as the preamble of the Constitution says, to provide for the common defense. Certainly a common defense is much easier under those conditions than it is when you have separate political bodies. On the other hand, I do not exclude the possibility at all of having a highly organized military unity without political unity. We certainly had it during the war. During the war there was a combined Chiefs of Staff. In the European theater you had General Eisenhower, who was in command not only of the American forces but everybody's forces. The question really comes down to whether nations are willing voluntarily to accept a measure of control over their forces by persons of another nationality in time of peace. They do it in time of war. They can do it in time of peace. The only question is whether they think that the danger is so great that they need to make what is not regarded as a normal peacetime sacrifice.

Now, I think that we do face a situation where the danger is so great, where the consequences of not combining are so serious both in terms of military effectiveness and in terms of the cost of sustaining a military establishment, that there will be increasing acceptance of that point of view. It is quite possible.

³ For text of an address by Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, made at San Francisco, Calif., on Sept. 19, 1957, see *ibid.*, Oct. 21, 1957, p. 639.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on a related subject, could you give us your thinking on the purported proposal to extend the scope of NATO to include in some form or another the Middle East?

A. There has been a good deal of thought given to the possibility of drawing more closely together, and perhaps unifying, the various collective-security arrangements that exist in the world. You have NATO; you have the Baghdad Pact; you have SEATO; you have the Rio Treaty and various bilateral treaties of the United States with Korea, Japan, the Republic of China, and so forth. It's quite obvious that each of these groupings, more or less regional, is concerned with what goes on in other areas. However, I would think it would be overambitious at the present time to try to put them all together and that perhaps an arrangement whereby each is kept more fully informed about developments in the other area would be better than attempting to create a combined organization of some 50 nations. The regional approach still seems to me to be somewhat better.

International Police Force

Q. Mr. Secretary, had you given any thought to evolving the NATO organization along the lines of an international police force?

A. We have given a great deal of thought and I have expended quite a few words at one time or another in trying to develop the concept that the forces that we maintain are essentially collective-security forces which perform, within the society of nations, a function somewhat comparable to that which is performed by a police force within a city, and so forth. We have a force to which various people contribute. It's available wherever there is need—a threatened breach of the peace or breach of the peace. I think it is useful to develop this idea as against the idea which the Soviets are constantly trying to spread, that these are military groupings with aggressive purposes.

Now, the only purpose of these associations is to do what, as the Eisenhower-Macmillan declaration said, "ought to be done by the United Nations through such a force as would be created under article 43 of the charter of the United Nations. Now, if that had ever been put into operation, you probably would never have had—and would

not have needed to have—the collective-security arrangements such as NATO, SEATO, and the like. So that the existence of these collective-defense organizations, which is authorized by article 51 of the charter, is in a way a substitute for what might be called an international police force under the charter.

Perhaps the word "police force" is not properly descriptive of the thing as it stands now. But I think it is proper to try to develop the idea that the whole purpose of these organizations, and their military establishments, is to maintain law and order and to help the victim of an armed attack. They are a development, or a movement toward the development, within the society of nations, of the same trend as leads to the development of a police force within a community.

I think I have said here several times that in the primitive society each man looks out for himself with his own gun and his own dog and so forth. You gradually get away from that and you get into a collective-defense arrangement. That is what we are moving toward. It would be better, as the declaration of President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan said, if we could do it through the United Nations. But this is the best substitute.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in connection with the Soviet satellite launchings, there was over the weekend a new statement from Mr. Khrushchev that he considers that overseas bases, particularly, I think, meaning United States overseas bases, are now outdated by the existence of missiles. Do you consider that American bases are obsolete or are becoming obsolete?

A. No, I do not so consider. Of course, that is largely a military judgment. But certainly the advice I get from our military people is that the maintenance of these bases, with their accompanying capacity to retaliate from different directions, is an immense addition to, and a great value to, the deterrent power that we exercise.

Assessment of the Danger

Q. Mr. Secretary, a few moments ago you said that you thought we faced a situation where the danger is very great today. Could you tell us whether you think the danger is greater than, say, a year ago? And if so, why? What accounts for this increase in danger?

* For text, see *ibid.*, Nov. 11, 1957, p. 739.

A. I didn't recall that I said that the danger today was very great. I don't recall what the context of that was.

Q. Well, you were talking about NATO and the idea of political unity. And you said you thought that we faced a situation where the danger was so great that there might be receptivity to certain things. And my question is, is the danger today greater than it was, say, a year ago, and if so, why?

A. Perhaps I did not express myself quite accurately. It would be more accurate to say that the danger of standing alone is so great that I think there is an increasing tendency to draw together. Now, that is due to the fact that there has been a steady growth in the weapons capabilities of the Soviet Union. I referred to that before. You have had here a span of 40 years during which the efforts of the Soviet rulers have been channeled into this one purpose—of trying to develop the technical skills to equal and, if possible, to surpass us in the military field. And with people of the intelligence of the Russians, or some of them, and the training they get, it is inevitable that they should make steady progress in that direction.

As I pointed out, I think, here before, some years ago we had the atomic bomb and they had none. Finally they got it. That was a step in closing the gap. We had the hydrogen bomb. They had none. They get it and that further closes the gap. They are now far advanced in the field of missiles. We are pretty far advanced too. It looks as though in some respects they are somewhat ahead of us. But I don't think that you will get, during the foreseeable future, a situation where the preponderance of power of the West, and particularly the United States, will be as great as it was, let us say, in 1948 or '49—10 years ago. There is no possibility, in the face of the technological skills which they have and as long as they maintain the ability to direct the efforts of their peoples in that direction, of maintaining the kind of a great gap that did exist a decade ago.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could we localize this assessment of danger in a specific area? Many weeks ago, when Ambassador Henderson came back from the Middle East, he spoke in words of strong concern about the danger there.⁵ You corrob-

rated some of that in your own statements, and for a while the situation seemed to be getting desperately worse. All of a sudden, on the surface at least, it seems to have collapsed. Has it indeed collapsed, and what is your own personal assessment of what the situation is now?

A. Well, let me first make clear that the danger that I spoke of before and was talking about was not a localized danger but a general danger which exists with the inevitable growth of Soviet Communist military power. Now, as far as the localization in the Middle East is concerned, there has been a danger there—there still is a danger there, just as there is in many other spots in the world. The Soviets seem to have tried to build up that danger as being a danger that stemmed from Turkey. It looks as though they had done that, perhaps, as a smokescreen. You know, it's a usual tactic to accuse others of doing the things which they intend to do themselves. I think that is evident in the statement where Zhukov is dismissed on the ground that he was guilty of "adventurism" in foreign affairs. Well, the only "adventurism" in foreign affairs that recently occurred were the threatening gestures against Turkey at a time when Zhukov had been sent off on this detour of 3 weeks to Yugoslavia and to Albania.

Now, the charges that have collapsed are the charges of the Soviet Union which collapsed because they had no substance behind them ever. But that doesn't mean that the situation in the Middle East is free of danger and that the independence of these Arab states is secure. I think it is in danger.

Technological Achievements

Q. Mr. Secretary, in answering the question before last you said that one of the reasons, or the reason, for the recent Soviet technological achievements is that they have been concentrating for 40 years on this military aspect of technology. And on Friday [November 1] the President's Committee of Scientists and Engineers briefed the press on this issue and said, and I'm quoting, "We must puncture this myth that the Russians succeeded by concentrating all energies on military things. They have concentrated on so broad a variety of fields that it reads like a list of everything that man can do." And they started reeling off a list of subjects on which the Russians

⁵ *Ibid.*, Sept. 23, 1957, p. 487.

had achieved as great a success as they have in missiles. There seems to be a disagreement. And they were quoting the CIA on this issue. There seems to be some disagreement.

A. If I said they were concentrating just upon the military, that was too narrow a statement of the case. They have been concentrating primarily upon scientific and technical work, which is largely utilized by the military although not exclusively so. But they do not allow many of their youth, I think any of their youth, to go to theological seminaries because there aren't any such in the Soviet Union. And they do not attempt to maintain the kind of a balanced society that we have.

If we had, for the last 40 years, been compelling all the students in our universities, high schools, and the like, to concentrate on scientific and technological matters, we probably would have been much further advanced than we are in that field. I don't think we want to have an unbalanced society of the kind that they have. This nation became a great nation in the world without having a great military establishment because it did the kind of things that enriched the life of the people and of individuals. And I do not think that we want to be drawn, by the competition of an atheistic and materialistic society, into just trying to match a particular pattern that they establish for themselves.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there have been reports, or rumors anyhow, that Russia this week would make an attempt to hit the moon with a missile. If such an accomplishment should occur, would it surprise or concern you? (Laughter)

A. Well, that is a pretty hypothetical question. I think you better ask that of somebody else.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said a while ago, I believe, that it looks as though the Soviets are ahead of us in some respects on missiles. What respects did you have in mind, and are they such that we could catch up?

A. Are they such as we can catch up?

Q. Yes. I mean, is this a very serious lag on our part that can or cannot be closed?

A. Well, I feel assured that we can catch up, but of course you realize that the Department of State is not expert in the field of missiles. We have plenty of problems of our own, but developing missiles is not one of them. Nor do we claim to be experts in that field. All the information that I get on this subject I get from another department of the Government.

Q. Mr. Secretary, at your last press conference you talked to us about the importance of increasing the knowledge of other people in the free world of the defense capabilities of the West. In that connection, are we planning, or do you favor, the establishment of intermediate-range missile bases in Europe as fast as they become available to us, to help drive home this knowledge?

A. We already have, as you know, the arrangement made in Bermuda for the establishment of an intermediate-missiles unit in the United Kingdom. I would think it would be desirable to have them elsewhere.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in light of the propaganda advantage the Soviet Union apparently has gained from the successful launching of its two earth satellites, do you wish from a foreign-policy standpoint that the United States would hurry up and get one up there?

A. I think it would be helpful to demonstrate, as I think we shall, that we have developed a comparable capability in these respects.

Q. Mr. Secretary, did you see the German Ambassador yesterday, and, if so, could you tell us what was discussed?

A. I saw him briefly. He came in to see somebody else. He dropped by to see me, and we talked primarily about this coming NATO meeting.

Q. Thank you, sir.

New Dimensions in Diplomacy

by Under Secretary Herter¹

For me, and for others in your Government concerned with the conduct of our foreign relations, this is a significant meeting. A body of private citizens has taken an important initiative. The Commission has brought together a numerous and representative group of Americans for the purpose of discussing the strengthening of relations between the peoples of this nation and the peoples of the nations of Asia.

If you will permit the introduction of a personal note, I have had a rewarding and lifelong association with Asia and its culture. My grandfather traveled extensively in the Far East and brought back to this country the first Japanese prints ever seen here. My mother and father, both artists, went to Asia for their honeymoon and thereafter brought into our home prints, paintings, carvings, and many other things of beauty from the Orient. These lovely Asian portrayals of line, form, and color were a part of the environment into which I was born and have lived with ever since. Thus, I have a sense of personal association with the subject this conference will discuss.

Let me call to your particular attention the framework of the meeting. We do not deal with the easing of crisis, the resolution of disputes, or the colder, grimmer political concerns that sometimes seem to dominate our official activities. We move in the warmer, more human area of mutual appreciation and understanding of cultural, so-

cial, and spiritual values in Asia and the West. Admittedly, action in the arena of politics, with all the stresses and strains of international rivalries, is a primary function of our Government, and a number of others. But let us also recognize that explorations of ways to better understanding are vital long-range efforts that hold, for us, a main hope for creating the kind of international climate needed for the establishment of an enduring and an equitable peace. Insofar as that is true, this conference, and the complementary activities we can expect to flow from it, supplies an essential positive facet to our work of building world peace. It was with this in mind that I chose my subject for this talk tonight.

We are all aware of the profound change that has taken place in diplomacy since the turn of the century. No longer is the diplomat concerned simply with the routine of maintaining official contacts, of dealing with individual consular problems, or of representing his country at ceremonial functions. The working diplomat today finds himself involved in a vast range of professional and technical responsibilities that may range from negotiating the export of a nuclear reactor to distributing a new strain of wheat, from reconciling technical problems in radio broadcasting to negotiating for exchange visits of two great symphony orchestras.

Cultural Diplomacy, the First Dimension

This vastly increased importance of cultural diplomacy is one of the new dimensions with which we are concerned tonight. Traditionally all nations have looked upon their ambassadors in foreign posts as representatives of their national cultures. But in times past the cultural element in

¹Address made before the first plenary session of the Sixth National Conference of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO at San Francisco, Calif., on Nov. 6 (press release 619). The theme of the conference was "Asia and the United States: What the American Citizen Can Do To Promote Mutual Understanding and Cooperation."

diplomacy has been taken for granted rather than dynamically developed. Now, in the middle of the 20th century, nations have suddenly come to realize that the cultural values and achievements of other nations are no longer merely matters of casual interest for a few scholars and members of the intellectual elite.

We need not look far for the cause. Technology has made the world smaller. Nations suddenly find themselves living as close neighbors, as it were, on a crowded street. This proximity has made the need for understanding an urgent and vital matter for us all.

We have to know what motivates other peoples in order to know what we may expect of our neighbors, what "makes them tick," what worries them, how they look from their inner world at the outer world we all share. And it is of the utmost importance that *they* have the same kinds of insights and understandings. Without knowledge and understanding there can be no mutual confidence and no solid basis for satisfactory mutual cooperation. The reverse—misunderstanding—can lead to miscalculation and mistrust, and the grave consequences that spring therefrom.

So I assert with great earnestness, and with a great sense of urgency, that mutual cultural understanding—cultural understanding in breadth and in depth—is one of the great needs of this diverse and multinational world of ours. Indeed, understanding of this kind is an essential in reaching intelligent political decisions.

Our Government recognizes the importance of this mutual cultural understanding and for many years now has devoted very substantial budgets to activities of a cultural nature. Some of them have involved making *our* culture better understood abroad. Some of them provide opportunities for Americans to get deeper insights into the cultural values and achievements of foreign nations.

However, we should take careful note that all cultural diplomacy does not have mutual understanding as its objective. There is a second kind of cultural diplomacy, a perversion of the first—a cultural diplomacy which is no more than a mask to disguise a pursuit of narrow political advantages. This kind of cultural diplomacy seeks to penetrate another country in order to develop internal political forces which eventually will corrupt its national life and replace traditional

values with an alien ideology antagonistic to the freedom of the human spirit and to the creativeness of the individual.

Can a nation distinguish between these two types of cultural diplomacy? If a powerful nation proposes to a weaker neighbor a cultural interchange in which the emphasis is put on mutual appreciation and some form of cultural activity, what are the tests of sincerity and good intentions? The best test is a willingness to receive cultural influence as well as to exert it. There are nations which produce vast quantities of propaganda about themselves and their achievements and disseminate this information abroad in a score of different ways. Yet they resort to extraordinary efforts to shield their populations from foreign ideas and cultural influences. They are willing to export but not to import. There are instances where grave doubt exists over their willingness to import—to accept.

For some time now the Communists have been extremely active in cultural exchange. The scale and timing of some of their efforts have been such that Western correspondents have described them as "cultural offensives"! The term implies conquest. It evokes memories, for example, of the suppression and eventual obliteration of the cultures of Uzbek and Turkestan by their Czarist overlords.

It is profitless to speculate here about Communist intentions in this area of activity. However, there is a basic paradox in their interest in cultural exchange that seems to have escaped most observers. Communism is avowedly materialistic. Ask a Marxist about belief in God and he will tell you that science is God. For him things of the spirit are fictions of an immature mind. Can we not ask, then, what kind of cultural understanding can be developed between people who deify science and those whose lives are attuned to religious principles—be they Hindu, Buddhist, Confucian, Taoist, Muslim, Shintoist, or Christian? What kind of mutual appreciation can be cultivated between devotees of materialism and societies whose highest expression is that of the spirit?

We do not need to answer these questions here. It is enough for us—and that pronoun includes all free peoples—to keep them in the forefront of our thinking.

At this point a little self-inspection is in order.

Certain critics of America delight in talking of the materialism of our society. This is a stereotype as invalid as most stereotypes. I believe a perceptive observer, one who is neither overwhelmed nor distracted by our industrial complex, would see *beyond* our workaday concern with making a living. He would properly identify our true motivations in the literature, the painting, and the music that has been so abundantly produced by American artists. Certainly we attend to practical concerns. But most of us have primary interests in matters of the mind and spirit.

What then of our capacity to receive, to appreciate the culture of others, to import? In my view we need no further evidence of this than the fact of this meeting.

You have come here because of a desire to learn more about our neighbors across the Pacific and the rich and varied cultures of which they are so justly proud. In the next few days you will make fresh contact with the philosophies, customs, and traditions of Asia. You will get a further insight into the many contributions that Asian art, letters, and thought have made to the West. You will have reviewed the finest products of civilizations that were old when North America was still a wilderness. You will hear, firsthand, various Asian points of view. In the process you will note many similarities and many differences. Both are important.

You are familiar with the axiom "To know all is to understand all." Let me clarify this term "understanding." It does not necessarily involve affection or dislike. These two emotions are beside the point. What I am driving at is knowledge of the other—the true image instead of the stereotype, an appreciation of similarities, and a tolerance, perhaps even a relish, for differences. These, I think, are the ingredients of a working understanding, which, in turn, is the foundation of smooth relations between nations and people.

Mutuality, the Second Dimension

The second new dimension of diplomacy I would like to underscore I shall call mutuality. This grows out of the increasing recognition of the mutual dependence of nations and peoples on one another and of the mutual benefit to be gained from common action.

This dimension arises from a twofold need. One concerns the development of knowledge about a nation that shows signs of being less than friendly. Obviously, an accurate understanding and analysis is a requisite to any effective handling of the situation. We need to know about intentions, objectives, and the strength of the motivating force.

This is distinguished from, but related to, the second need, which is more constructive in its aims. If effective and solidly constructed cooperation is planned, a comprehensive knowledge of the proposed partner, his culture and his customs, is essential. For example, a leader in another land makes a statement that affects American interests, official or unofficial. Yet a correct translation of that statement may be totally inadequate to our purposes, because the English translation may mean something entirely different from what the original statement meant in the social circumstances in which it was made. In effect, it is risky to assume that you understand what a man says unless you understand the man.

I believe that the vitality and the wide spectrum of American culture derives from our history—from our capacity to absorb the contribution offered by the many ethnic groups that have emigrated to America. However, these cultural infusions, or transfusions, have originated for the most part in the West. I think it is time we turned east toward Asia to listen and to learn. The delegates attending this conference have a rare opportunity to set a pattern which can be adopted from here, at the Pacific gateway, all the way to my home city of Boston.

Multilateral Action, the Third Dimension

We come now to a third new dimension which has paralleled the evolution of mutuality; it is the increasing resort to multilateral action. In mentioning this development one is deeply impressed with the propriety of San Francisco's invitation to the National Commission to hold this Sixth Conference on Asian-American relations here. It was in San Francisco, this magically beautiful city, that the most important of all manifestations of this concept came into being. That was the great landmark in history, 12 years ago, when the United Nations was formed.

Since that day in 1945, 12 turbulent years have

passed. We have come through a period of extraordinary difficulties—one which imposed severe trials on the U.N. and the family of specialized agencies linked to it. In general, we can truly say that these tests have been met. We can further state that these agencies are the wiser and stronger for their experience.

We have also seen established certain capabilities which attach exclusively to these organizations. We have reached the point, in my view, where the United Nations offers the most hopeful means of dealing with a number of problems of prime international concern. I believe, as well, that we are approaching a stage where the same thing may be true of the specialized agencies.

I believe that more and more nations will be persuaded that UNESCO is filling, and filling well, the role for which it was intended. As you know, UNESCO's work in education has been most effective. The organization has been able to provide technical assistance to more than a score of its member nations who sought help in setting up a public school system. UNESCO missions have also done important pioneering in teaching men the skills they need to get more out of their environment. And the agency has launched a 10-year program to get every child in Latin America in school. It is helping to provide schools for children who have none and to teach illiterate adults to read and write.

Allow me, at this point, to serve warning. UNESCO and its partner agencies are not directly involved in political matters and so touch on the areas of trade and economic affairs only as a corollary to their main function. Despite this, we would be ill advised to assign to these agencies a position of minor importance. Many of their accomplishments are chain-reactive.

The World Health Organization's dramatic drive to wipe out malaria is more than the elimination of a disease. It is a move to restore whole populations to health and vitality. This cannot fail to have a marked impact on productivity and consumption. The U.N. Children's Fund and the Food and Agriculture Organization are improving the basic diet of millions of people.

I have recently returned from an extended tour through free Asia. It was my privilege to at-

tend the ceremonies whereby the Federation of Malaya officially became a sovereign power. As I witnessed the transfer of authority from the colonial governor to the newly elected Malayan chief of state, I was deeply conscious of the fact that this was the tenth such occurrence to take place in the area since World War II. It would be a dull person, indeed, who would not conclude that a drive for freedom and self-determination has swept the perimeter of Asia with the force of a tidal wave.

But I was more deeply impressed with a feeling of matching intensity that I encountered in many places. This was the realization that illiteracy, sickness, misery, and the other tragic components of a submarginal existence were not for them, or for anyone, a necessary condition of life. The peoples of Asia, products of an ancient and honorable civilization, are keenly aware that the materials of the essentials of life are around them and that the technical knowledge needed for the fuller development of their environment exists.

I believe that in large degree Asian leaders are glad to seek from their associates in the free world the technical training so desperately needed throughout the region. This I am glad to say is now being supplied not alone by our own Government and private organizations and individuals in this country but also, and I hope ever more effectively, through the U.N. and its associated agencies.

The United States Government, as any responsible government should, engages in an almost continuous review of policy. I can report that the functions of the specialized agencies, especially UNESCO, are receiving close scrutiny because it is evident that they are assuming an increasingly vital role in the improvement of relations—between governments, yes, but more particularly between peoples. I feel confident that concrete evidence of this view will appear before many weeks have passed. The heartening initiative displayed in convening this conference adds to this conviction.

We wish you every success and hope the repercussions of your meetings will spread throughout this land and the lands across the Pacific.

UNESCO: One Road to Peace

by Andrew H. Berding

Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs¹

All of us have been interested in—and sometimes dismayed by—the developments that have affected the growth of international cooperation since the founding of the United Nations. That all our high expectations of the United Nations have not come to pass should not be too surprising. It is certainly less surprising than the fact that the United Nations has been able to deal with so wide a range of difficult and serious problems not even contemplated in 1945.

An aggressive international communism bent on conquest and subversion has put the United Nations to severe tests. It has sorely tried nations and groups of nations which have sought to create the conditions of peace in the postwar world. And it has made more difficult the cooperation of nations through such specialized agencies as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Yet I am convinced that in the 12 years since 1945 the people of the United States have not seriously wavered in their firm support of UNESCO. As understanding grows and deepens, more of us are finding more to approve and less to criticize in the substantial work UNESCO and its member states have under way around the world.

I have been impressed by the care with which a number of nongovernmental organizations in this country have examined not only the program of UNESCO but also its aims and methods. Moreover, the Subcommittee on International Or-

ganizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee conducted hearings this year on the specialized agencies. The hearings lasted several months, and the record runs to more than 900 pages of testimony. Persons critical of UNESCO as well as those favoring the organization had full opportunity to be heard.

The subcommittee filed its report recently,² and it could find no foundation in fact for the criticisms most commonly made about UNESCO. In this democracy of ours we attach a great deal of importance to the findings of an authoritative committee of Congress, and I hope this report will encourage many Americans who could not themselves make a careful study of UNESCO.

This morning Dr. Veronese³ and Dr. Evans⁴ have provided substantial insight into UNESCO's present operations and future prospects. This afternoon you will examine some of the results of UNESCO's work and suggest guidelines for the consideration of those who plan our Government's policy toward this organization.

I want to say to the members of the National Commission that we value the thoughtful study you give to the international program of UNESCO. Our appreciation of your efforts is indicated in part by the fact that, with rare exceptions, your advice on the UNESCO program has been accepted by the Department of State

¹ Address made at the annual meeting of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO at San Francisco, Calif., on Nov. 5 (press release 609 dated Nov. 4).

² The United Nations Specialized Agencies: Report of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, July 1, 1957. [Committee print.]

³ Vittorino Veronese, chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO.

⁴ Luther Evans, Director General of UNESCO.

throughout the past 11 years. This advice has become the basis for the positions of our Government on the program of UNESCO in every session of the General Conference.

At this meeting you will, I hope, give instructions or guidance to your committees which will meet in the next several months. Thus you will assist them in making recommendations to the Government on the program proposed by the Director General for 1959-60.

As you carry forward your discussions here, and in the months to come, I hope you will consider not only what the international program should include but also what we as a government and what your institutions and organizations should be willing to undertake in fulfillment of that program.

In the early years, when the program of UNESCO was in a formative stage, I am told that we were hard pressed to answer a certain question. It was asked by those who were eager to help. The question was: "What can I do?" That is no longer a problem. As the program of UNESCO has developed, the need for action on our part as a member state becomes more evident. There are many opportunities for capable volunteers.

The General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. And it called upon UNESCO to help secure worldwide understanding of the declaration. UNESCO, in turn, called upon the national commissions of the member states to carry out this task. As we are about to enter the 12th year, it might be well for our National Commission, and for all others, to ask whether we have done this task well and what more needs doing.

As UNESCO's program unfolds, its projects become more arresting. The major project on "Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values" is a good illustration.

I congratulate you on your decision of a year ago to devote your Sixth National Conference to this theme. I have seldom seen a conference program of so much interest and promise. But the end is not here. What will follow the conference? What tasks require the action of the organizations you represent? What tasks should Government agencies undertake? And will we both be able to take the necessary action to do

our full part as a member state in the furtherance of this 10-year project?

In good part, the answer to those questions rests with you. Your conference will unfold a wide and important range of efforts in this country directed toward an understanding between Asian peoples and ourselves and toward increased cooperation. But it may highlight, as well, the limitations on our present understanding of Asian culture and peoples and point to steps we need to take.

Role of U.S. National Commission

What will the role of the National Commission be in taking these steps or in encouraging others to take them?

As you know, UNESCO is unique among the agencies of the United Nations in that no other agency has a National Commission or similar mechanism to advise and assist the member states in carrying out its program. As you also know, the lines of responsibility for action as between the Government and the National Commission are not precise.

In 1946, when Congress adopted the joint resolution authorizing membership in UNESCO and establishing the National Commission, little was known of the kind of program the organization would have. Little was known of the challenge this program would present. Thus the legislation is general rather than detailed as to the types of action we would employ for the discharge of our responsibility as a member state.

It was timely, therefore, for the commission, at its meeting a year ago, to call for a review of its work in its first decade and for a study of possibilities of strengthening itself. We in the Department of State wish to give encouragement to this kind of independent study. Those who conduct it will receive our full cooperation.

At the same time we are conscious of our governmental responsibility toward UNESCO. In response to recommendations made by Mr. Allyn⁵ when he returned from the New Delhi conference last year, we have begun in Washington a study of our Government's relationship to UNESCO. We would like to determine whether we can make our participation in

⁵ Stanley C. Allyn, chairman of the U.S. delegation to the ninth session of the UNESCO General Conference.

UNESCO more useful for ourselves and for the organization as a whole.

We have, therefore, taken our cue from the National Commission. Now is a suitable time for a fresh examination of our interests in this organization. For the U.S. concept of cultural diplomacy, of which participation in UNESCO is a part, is not a static concept. We have witnessed, since the end of the Second World War, an expansion of unexpected magnitude in educational, scientific, and cultural cooperation with other peoples. We may freely say that cultural diplomacy has become an indispensable element in the conduct of foreign relations, taking its place as a partner in foreign political and economic relations.

A New Diplomacy

But it is not the relative newness of cultural cooperation that gives this aspect of foreign policy its special significance. It is, instead, the fact that in the conduct of educational, scientific, and cultural relations with other people an area is emerging that is not the preserve of traditional diplomats alone. It is one in which the participation of millions of our people is necessary.

Consequently we are rapidly developing a kind of partnership between the Government and institutions and groups in a new manifestation of diplomacy that overcomes many traditional barriers. This method of diplomacy brings us into close contact with large numbers of people in other countries on what we have come to call a "people to people" basis. It may be significant that this is a term that Milton Eisenhower and George Stoddard and other UNESCO founders used in describing their concept of UNESCO. They termed it a "people to people" agency.

So rapid has been this postwar development of educational, scientific, and cultural contact that many people have not had occasion to view it in the sum total of its importance.

It would be desirable to have members of the National Commission and their organizations help to interpret this new aspect of diplomacy and to engage more well-prepared people in it. For, if ever a people had the opportunity to share in the conduct of foreign relations of a nation, the American people have that opportunity today.

What are some of these activities which, like

UNESCO, require the response of numbers of people and partnership between private citizens and their government?

Exchange of Persons

One of the efforts most nearly akin to the methods of UNESCO is the international exchange-of-persons program. This was authorized with some of the other American Republics under the terms of the Buenos Aires convention back in 1936. In 1946 an amendment to the Surplus Property Act, sponsored by Senator William Fulbright, increased the number of countries participating in educational exchange and extended our binational exchange program to Europe, Africa, and Asia. The Smith-Mundt act of 1948 put the educational-exchange program on a worldwide basis and increased the number and types of participants. Perhaps this is the cultural-exchange program best known to Americans, for there is hardly a community that has not benefited directly from these exchanges.

Many American communities have provided students, teachers, specialists, and professors to go abroad for educational purposes. They have seen these persons return enriched in their own knowledge and experience. Many of these returning exchangees have been able to help their communities gain a better understanding of the traditions, values, and achievements of other peoples. In doing so they have helped broaden the horizons of their fellow citizens.

Many American communities, too, have received foreign students, teachers, professors, research scholars, specialists, and leaders from around the world. These communities have gained much from this first-hand contact with the representatives of other cultures. In this way a new dimension has been added to American adult education.

At the same time, many of the Americans who go to other countries under the program assist in strengthening educational, technical, and professional institutions and other facilities in those countries. Some help improve and extend the teaching of the English language. Some interpret American history, law, literature, architecture, art, and ideas.

They bring back increased knowledge of the languages and literatures, governments and histories, and arts and sciences of other countries.

They thereby contribute to more adequate study of foreign areas in the United States, and they provide a pool of competent manpower and intelligent leadership now needed by business, governmental, and educational institutions in their overseas operations.

In both cases, we know the American and foreign grantees alike have furthered adult education both at home and abroad. They have received something of value for themselves. They have discussed their own cultural heritage with groups and individuals in their host countries. And upon return home they have shared their new knowledge and understanding with their colleagues and fellow countrymen.

This program, therefore, is particularly suited to bridging cultural differences and promoting the mutual understanding and appreciation now so necessary between peoples. In this process of exchange we are building a more solid foundation of healthy international relationships which will facilitate future cooperation.

In 1956 more than 3,500 persons from 88 countries and territories came to this country under the International Educational Exchange Program and 1,700 Americans went to 67 other countries for educational purposes. Substantial though these numbers are, it is important to view them in perspective by recalling that the great majority of foreign visitors who are in the United States for educational purposes are completely financed by private American resources and financial resources of other governments. For example, in the same academic year—1956—nearly 41,000 foreign students were enrolled in American schools, some 1,150 foreign teachers and research scholars received appointments to American faculties, and 6,700 foreign physicians were working in American hospitals. In the reverse order, about 11,000 Americans went abroad for study, research, teaching, or similar educational, scientific, and cultural purposes.

Thus the predominantly private character of educational exchange is emphasized. All of these activities, both public and private, point to the increasing importance of direct people-to-people relationships. This great postwar growth in cultural contact across national boundaries illustrates to us that the conduct of foreign relations is no longer the sole responsibility of an official. It is likewise the urgent task of unofficial millions.

University Contracts

A second effort of the Government in cooperation with private institutions is the International Cooperation Administration program of university contracts. Through this arrangement American universities make available their knowledge and experience to overseas areas which have requested help. This help consists of providing advice and assistance in the establishment or improvement of host institution curricula, teaching methods, research and extension activities, library facilities, and provision of books and other related equipment. All this is adjusted to the needs of the country concerned. The American universities send professors overseas in this endeavor and also train host-institution faculty or prospective faculty members both in the United States and at their own institutions.

The number of Americans abroad under the university contract program is about 600, while some 300 foreign scholars are studying in this country. In all, 54 American universities are cooperating with universities and technical institutions in 38 foreign countries and territories.

In many of these areas the United States mission has an opportunity to operate with UNESCO and with other international agencies working toward common goals.

It is clear that these exchanges are by no means of value only to the host countries. American professors and technicians return to their own campuses with increased knowledge, greater understanding of important foreign areas, and a clearer view of American responsibilities in a world that continues to shrink.

Libraries and Information Centers

Still a third activity of the Government in the educational, scientific, and cultural field is conducted by the United States Information Agency, which maintains libraries and information centers in 64 countries. The information center staffs arrange lecture and concert programs, provide classes in English-language teaching, and schedule film showings and other cultural events. The American information library makes available materials on American culture and institutions.

In many countries, particularly in Latin America, binational centers have been established to foster better understanding between the host

countries and the United States. These centers are locally organized and are autonomous. Like the libraries at United States information centers, they are depositories of American printed and recorded materials.

The stimulation of interest in American books goes beyond libraries and binational centers. A translation program overcomes language barriers. A low-priced book program makes available through commercial channels many books normally limited in sale because of prices. In areas where dollar shortages have impeded the flow of American books, a plan similar to UNESCO's own book-coupon program enables soft-currency countries to secure books and other educational materials from the United States through regular commercial channels. Through press, broadcasting, television, and motion-picture services USIA furnishes its information centers overseas with up-to-date commentary and background information on American institutions and cultural developments.

Through a developing people-to-people program, private groups in the United States are being encouraged to increase their overseas cultural contacts. Some 42 committees, organized along lines of professional or group interest, have been established at the invitation of President Eisenhower to form affiliations with similar groups in other countries and to work out cooperative programs with them.

In late 1954 President Eisenhower initiated a new program to help step up the appearances of American performing artists overseas. Upon his recommendation Congress made available a special fund to encourage American cultural and athletic groups to undertake overseas tours which might not be fully self-supporting on a commercial basis. Last year the cultural presentations program was given a more permanent status through the passage of the Humphrey-Thomson Act. The program aims to display distinguished American achievements in the performing arts as examples of an important aspect of our national life.

Since the first presentation in 1954, more than 90 groups and individual artists have performed in some 85 countries. They have produced increased understanding of and respect for our concern with the arts and with some of our achievements.

Following a tour by the Cleveland Symphony Orchestra a Polish newspaper reported that the tour "brought about a complete change among Polish listeners in their opinion on musical culture in the U.S."

In Manila a newspaper reported a similar reaction in these words: "Asians by the thousands have modified their concept of America as an originally materialistic country, after going through the beautiful experience of listening to an American symphony orchestra."

The performing artists themselves have spoken with enthusiasm of the value to them in exchanging knowledge and ideas with their foreign colleagues and in interpreting to other countries the American appreciation of the cultural heritage of all people.

The Library of Congress carries out an extensive exchange of official documents and publications, research treatises, music, maps, manuscripts, and other materials.

In the field of science our most notable cooperation with other nations is in the International Geophysical Year, about which we have heard a great deal in the past few weeks, and the newly created International Atomic Energy Agency.

This survey of a few cooperative efforts in the areas of education, science, and culture cannot be complete, even for those activities in which the Government has a part. And the efforts of government are multiplied many times by the private exchanges carried out by hundreds of universities and colleges, foundations, service organizations, fraternal and religious groups.

But surely this is enough to make clear to all of us that diplomacy, like a jewel, has many facets. It reveals to us that each facet must be ground and polished if it is properly to reflect the light. The conduct of foreign relations cannot be carried out exclusively by those officially charged with the task. The task has grown as our view of the world and our contact with the world's peoples have increased. It has grown with our acceptance of responsibility for helping other peoples bridge the gulf between feudalism and the mid-20th century. It has grown with our determination to preserve for ourselves, and to assist others to achieve for themselves, dignity and human freedom. And it grows daily with our search for ways to strengthen the peace.

There is a role of service and responsibility for all of us in the conduct of this diplomacy.

United States Policy in the Far East

by Howard P. Jones

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs¹

I am honored to address this distinguished gathering of Japanese and American representatives of government, industry, and commerce. The Pacific Ocean has indeed become a broad highway, not a barrier, between our nations, and across this highway Americans and Japanese have traveled many times to trade and learn more of their trans-Pacific neighbor. Never before have our relations been so flourishing and mutually advantageous—as, indeed, certain golf matches played within the past few months in Washington and Tokyo so well attest.

Yet it was only a little over a century ago that Perry's black ships arrived in Japan. What a sharply contrasting picture can be drawn between those days, when Japan shunned dealings and contacts with the outside world, and the year 1957, when Japan has come to be a world leader in industry and commerce and when, within the past year alone, Japan joined the U.N. and was elected to its Security Council.

The United States has likewise undergone a surprising transformation in its role in world affairs. It wasn't so long ago that the United States tried to remain aloof from all the struggles and conflicts of the Old World. It took two world wars and a frightful toll in human life to convince us of the folly of isolationism. It took the additional annealing experience in Korea to convince us of the terrible cost of unilateral disarmament while there are still predatory forces abroad in the world.

Today the United States is superior in the nuclear field and intends to remain so. To maintain this position, however, we must, in the absence of adequate worldwide safeguards, continue our nu-

clear tests—which are kept to a minimum consistent with development—in order to retain our deterrent power, which remains the main deterrent power of the whole free-world community. We must keep going forward, lest we lose that capability. The United States will, of course, continue to seek agreement on a safeguarded program that includes the cessation of nuclear-weapons testing; but we would be discounting all the lessons of history if we overlooked accumulated evidence that the Soviets are trying to set a trap for us—to get us to cut back our superiority in the nuclear field while they attend to building up their superiority in ground forces.

In this shrinking planet isolationism is impossible. We have come to know that events in far-away lands can have profound effects on our own security and way of life. We have learned the hard way that trouble must not be allowed to spread and that the most effective way to prevent this from happening is through united action, with each country bearing its share of responsibility in accordance with its capabilities.

Because Japan and the United States are the two largest free nations bordering the Pacific, they must necessarily bear a proportionately large share of the responsibility for promoting the peace and welfare of the Far East. It goes without saying that they must work in unison.

What is the task they face in Asia?

The Far Eastern Scene

Asia is a continent in the throes of revolution. It is not a sudden convulsive revolution such as characterized the downfall of the *ancien regime* of 18th-century France; nor is it a revolution sparked by communism, as in Russia 40 years ago. The Asian revolution is a revolt against

¹ Address made before the Japan-American Pacific Area Conference of Mayors and Chamber of Commerce Presidents at San Diego, Calif., on Nov. 5 (press release 614).

poverty, backwardness, ignorance, servitude; it is the stirring of peoples all over that vast continent for better conditions of life, for equality in world affairs, for stature and dignity.

This revolution was not born in Moscow. It is not a Communist affair. On the other hand, the Communists know a good thing when they see it; they were only too ready to seize upon Asian nationalism and anticolonialism to turn it to communism's account. With promises of quick dramatic results, they held forth the Communist system as the only way for Asian countries to satisfy their aspirations.

It is grim irony that the Asian revolution, which is essentially a movement of liberation, has been so blighted in the Far East by the forces of communism. Less than one-third of the inhabitants of the Far East now enjoy freedom and independence. Two-thirds of the 900 million inhabitants are under Communist rule in mainland China, north Korea, and north Viet-Nam. International communism has acquired in China a huge central base of operations for encroaching on neighboring territories.

The free countries of Asia lie on the rimland, which for the most part narrowly fringes the Sino-Soviet colossus. Many of these countries are small and underdeveloped. The notable exception in the Far East is Japan with its highly developed industrial-mercantile complex.

Among the other salient factors to be noted about this area is that in all of the free Far Eastern nations the spirit of nationalism and independence runs high. Eight of the 13 countries in the Far East have gained their independence since 1945: Korea, Viet-Nam, Cambodia, Laos, Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, and the Philippines. With independence have come compelling demands from the people for greater security, for improved living conditions, and for more rapid economic growth.

In the days when international communism was more forthright in stating its objectives, Communist leaders in Russia and later in China proclaimed that it was their objective to expel the influences of the West from Asia and bring the whole area under Communist rule. Despite changes in Communist tactics, these objectives remain unchanged. As recently as September 1956 Mao Tse-tung declared before the Eighth Party Congress of the Chinese Communist

Party: "We must give active support to the national independence and liberation movements in countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. . . ."; and when a Chinese Communist speaks of "liberation," he means only one thing: the seizure of power by the Communist Party.

The Communist Threat

With Asia as its immediate target, international communism has waged an intensified and diversified campaign in this area during the past decade. Today the campaign is skillfully orchestrated to convince Asians that Moscow and Peiping stand ready to assist them in the fulfillment of their basic drive for equality and improvement of status.

Despite all of international communism's blandishments, inducements, and appearance of sweet reasonableness, force remains basic to the nature of the Communist challenge. Communist force has been widely used and continues to be used around the arc of free Asia. Its scale extends from the organized military aggression in Korea to terrorist bombings such as occurred the other day in Saigon. Today Chinese Communist forces are still massed in north Korea. In Southeast Asia they continue to violate the Geneva accords by providing the materiel for a major military buildup in north Viet-Nam. Peiping refuses to renounce the use of force in respect to Taiwan, repeatedly declaring its intention to gain possession of Taiwan, by armed attack if necessary. With millions of men under arms today, there is no evidence that recent Chinese Communist or Soviet tactics have involved any decline in emphasis on the military. In fact all the evidence points to a steady buildup of military power.

Just as force continues to be the major weapon in the Communist arsenal, so does the Communist apparatus abroad continue to be communism's next major weapon, its objective being subversion. This apparatus includes the vast complex of Communist Parties, front groups, agents and fellow travelers, operating to a greater or less degree in all of the Far Eastern countries, many of whose internal security deficiencies have facilitated communism's penetrative capability.

Propaganda is the third major Communist instrument. Russia and Red China claim to provide in their own "living examples" proof that Communist nations can rapidly attain order and

power, although they neglect to add at what a terrible sacrifice this is achieved in terms of human life and human values. At the same time, the Communists are out to sow suspicion and distrust among the free Asian countries and to direct Asian nationalism and anticolonialism against countries like the United States, whose cooperation and assistance are vitally needed in the task of promoting conditions of freedom, security, stability, and economic growth in Asia.

The fourth major Communist weapon is economic aid and political manipulations. Soviet and Red Chinese aid has been small in comparison to United States assistance, but it has been designed to have maximum propaganda value and has been concentrated against specific targets for reasons that need no explanation. Communist economic assistance is simply political penetration by economic means.

In all these undertakings, Communist China and Soviet Russia work in partnership, being linked by common ideology, common aims, and close interdependence. This was recently demonstrated by Mao's and Chou's public support of the Soviet Union's crushing of the Hungarian people's bid for freedom, even though this Soviet action outraged all the Far Eastern countries which Communist China was seeking favorably to impress—countries including the neutrals, which solidly voted with the United States in supporting the United Nations' condemnation of Soviet barbarity.

On September 27, 1957, Chou En-lai spoke as follows at a banquet in Peiping honoring his "dear comrade" Premier Janos Kadar of the Hungarian People's Republic:

Since they crushed the armed riots of counterrevolutionaries with the assistance of the great Soviet Union, the Hungarian people have under the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party and the worker-peasant revolutionary government achieved inspiring successes in upholding the socialist system, consolidating the proletarian dictatorship and rehabilitating the national economy.

What clearer testimony could there be of communism's hierarchy of values? Communist-bloc solidarity under the aegis of the Kremlin comes first and foremost; human liberty comes last. The hammer and sickle continues to fly over the rooftops of Budapest while at the bottom of the rubble of a crushed revolt lie the broken bodies of Hungarian patriots. This is communism's scale

of values, shared as much by the leaders in Peiping as in Moscow, and should be remembered by those who would substitute wishful thinking for facts when they talk of incipient Titoism in Peiping and of redesigning United States policies so as to drive wedges between Peiping and Moscow.

If we were to turn around now and pursue policies—such as recognition or removal of trade controls—which would have the effect of increasing Peiping's prestige and influence and economic strength, is there any reason to believe that this enhancement in the position of the Chinese Communist regime would interfere with its relationship with the U.S.S.R.? On the contrary, this achievement of Peiping's objectives would confirm to the Chinese Communists the great value of the Soviet alliance. It would be taken as clear evidence of free-world weakness and the historic inevitability of the Communist victory.

United States Policy

In the face of these varied threats to free Asia, it is the policy of the United States Government to help build up conditions of security, stability, and economic progress in free Asia as rapidly as possible.

We have joined in security treaties which make clear that attacks or encroachments on free nations of Asia would be considered as endangering our own peace and safety and that we and they would act in the common defense. Together we have backed up these commitments with military power, which is the only language would-be aggressors understand. The free nations of the Far East now have more than one and a half million men under arms. These forces, together with United States forces widely deployed across the Pacific, constitute the principal deterrent to aggression. They are essential to maintaining the peace.

Under the mutual defense assistance program the United States is currently providing around \$650 million per year in military assistance—that is, in supplying military hardware and training—and almost an equal amount for defense support. This defense support in effect helps pay for the large armies which certain small countries with weak economies could not otherwise afford. The bulk of this category of assistance goes to our hard-pressed allies in Korea, Taiwan, and Viet-

Nam. For it must be remembered that it is against these areas that Communist China and its satellites pose their most direct military threat. Moreover these three countries—Korea, China, and Viet-Nam—being divided, one part free and the other Communist-dominated, are necessarily areas of direct challenge.

Behind the common defense shield that is thus being built up, all the free nations of Asia can today breathe more easily. They can turn their attention to the essential task of creating internal conditions of security and stability without which it will not be possible to proceed with the economic development which they all recognize to be their number-one long-term objective.

We thoroughly sympathize with this objective and are supporting it in the following ways:

We offer technical know-how, make grants and loans for development projects, sell our agricultural food surpluses for local currency and then reloan most of this money on a long-term basis. We exchange teachers and students and train scientists and technicians. We encourage private American investment and moves to maximize free world trade.

For example, in the Philippines last year we assisted in a program to improve ports, harbors, and highways. We joined the Philippine Government in a training program aimed to raise the standards of health and education. We also assisted in projects to promote agricultural production and to exploit mineral resources.

In Viet-Nam, as another example, we have assisted the Vietnamese in their program to rehabilitate and modernize transportation, power, and communications facilities, and we have assisted them in the development of small industry and in the increase of agricultural productivity.

Further, we have engaged in a technical-assistance program for Indonesia and have assisted in the battle there to control the scourge of malaria.

I need not give further examples. In many of the Far Eastern countries we have freely given appropriate assistance in support of measures to strengthen developing economies.

An essential aspect of our policy in the Far East is our full support for the government of free China. I shall not dwell on the reasons for this policy for they have been recently stated with forthrightness and authority by the Secre-

tary of State in his address in San Francisco before the Lions International.² Suffice it to say that the free government on Taiwan stands as a symbol of resistance to communism not only for the untold millions oppressed on the Chinese mainland but also for some 12 million overseas Chinese. You cannot keep the hopes of these people alive unless there is a free alternative, just as during the darkest days of World War II the hopes of Europeans caught in the grip of Nazi occupation were kept alive by the existence of free governments in temporary exile. But the Government of the Republic of China is located on the island of Taiwan, which with its 600,000 Chinese soldiers garrisoned there is a key link in the free world's defense system. We are treaty-bound to the defense of free China, an ally of long standing and admirable fortitude.

Evaluating Our Policies

The only way to judge the validity of a policy is by its results. For 7 years now, since the start of the Korean war, the United States has played an active role in support of the free countries of the Far East. What has been accomplished in that period?

The Far East in 1950 was a discouraging sight to all except the Communists, who had just taken over the China mainland and were poised for further conquest. Korea was attacked in June 1950, and for a long time during that critical year it was touch-and-go whether Korea could be saved from the massed, organized Communist onslaught. Malaya and the Philippines were terrorized by elusive Communist groups operating out of the jungles. Indonesia had just put down a military coup sponsored by the Communists and was still fighting a guerrilla war with Communist bandits. There was civil war in Indochina and in Burma.

Contrast the situation in the Far East as we see it today, 7 years later:

Quick U.N. action—action which history may well find to have been the U.N.'s finest hour—resulted in collective efforts which prevented Communist seizure of South Korea. It is true that hostilities are only suspended today by an armistice, but we can rejoice that the Republic of Korea has made such progress during the past

² BULLETIN of July 15, 1957, p. 91.

few years in rehabilitating the nation and in providing for its internal and external security. Effective action has also been taken in the Philippines and in Malaya against terrorist groups, this being particularly important for the United Nations' newest member, Malaya. The long-drawn-out fighting in Indochina has now given way to several years of peace and steady progress toward security and economic goals. Economic growth in Japan and in Taiwan, meanwhile, has been most encouraging.

I do not wish to leave the impression that all is well in the Far East today. That is unfortunately far from being the case. But it is an occupational hazard of those of us who have to wrestle day in and day out with seemingly insoluble problems to feel that we are making little if any progress.

We would do well in such moments of frustration to remember that, in this long night of struggle between the forces of freedom and enslavement, the latter are plagued with profound internal difficulties; and, because they are attempting to shackle man's own free spirit, their problems are in the long run insoluble. Even the Communists have to reckon with the irrepressible demands of peoples throughout the Sino-Soviet bloc for greater freedom, more consumer goods, better conditions of life. If these demands are too far repressed, there will be an explosion. Yet if these demands are yielded to, even in a restricted way, there is likely to be an explosion or at least shattering disclosures as to the depth of discontent in these countries. Thus Mao Tse-tung, in order to strengthen his regime's ideological control in the face of mounting popular discontent, encouraged outspoken criticism. "Let a hundred flowers bloom together, let all schools of thought contend," he announced. This led to surprisingly severe criticisms of the regime—criticisms that were intolerable to that regime—and the end result was a purging of the so-called "rightist" elements and a return to conditions of even greater repression than existed before the flowers showed their heads above ground.

Conclusion

In concluding my necessarily generalized survey of our policies in the Far East, I should like

to revert to my earlier observations about how the United States and Japan came to discard isolationism and assume prominent roles in international affairs. This was perhaps the inevitable result of shrinking time and space due to technological developments. Certainly it had much to do, in the case of Japan, with the economic facts of Japan's existence: her large population, limited national resources, and dependence on trade for survival.

Yet the fundamental explanation for the important role which I believe Japan is destined to play in world affairs lies in the nature of the Japanese people.

To my friends from Japan I would say this: You occupy a highly strategic island position, that is true. But it is your national characteristics which make you so significant. You have the vital qualities of a well-organized, cohesive, highly civilized society. You are well educated, technically skilled, and energetic. You have built—and since World War II have rebuilt—the most advanced economy in Asia. Japan's merchant marine has in 12 years risen from near extinction to third place among all nations, and in shipbuilding Japan leads the world. The Japanese industrial plant has risen like the proverbial phoenix from the ashes of World War II to produce today twice as much as before the war. Though with a smaller homeland and having 20 million more mouths to feed, the Japanese have a higher standard of living than before the war. In fact, Japan's is just about the highest living standard in Asia today.

Such energy and talent is a tremendous asset to the world. Japan can make a particularly important contribution to the economic development of free Asia and Africa, and it will of course be in Japan's direct commercial interests that these areas remain free from Communist control. The mere fact that Japan has made such remarkable progress since the war under a democratic free system of government is living proof that that system of government permits rapid economic and technological advance notwithstanding all the preachings of communism to the contrary.

Japan and the United States are linked by more than geography, by more than trade, by more than alignments. They are bound by a common desire to preserve their own ways of life. Americans

and Japanese have been brought closely together in the world power struggle. Each has come to appreciate better the other's virtues and perhaps to be more tolerant of his shortcomings. Above all, it is a relationship of mutual advantage. Japan's support and friendship are as important to us as, I believe, the support and friendship of the United States is vital to Japan. As this gathering here today so well attests, we are striving on both sides of the Pacific to make that partnership ever more effective.

First Refugee From Far East Arrives in U.S. Under New Law

Following are texts of remarks made at Washington National Airport on November 4 by Roderic L. O'Connor, Administrator of Security and Consular Affairs, and Robert McCollum, Coordinator of the Special Immigration Program, on the occasion of the arrival from Korea of Mrs. Saing Kun Ko, the first refugee from the Far East to come to the United States under the recently amended Immigration and Nationality Act.

REMARKS BY MR. O'CONNOR

Press release 611 dated November 4

I am particularly happy to be here today, as a representative of the Department of State, to welcome you, Mrs. Saing Kun Ko, to the United States. It is our Department that has had the responsibility for issuing the visa which has allowed you to be here today. We are happy that you are coming to us from the land of our good friend and ally, the Republic of Korea, to which you had fled to escape Communist persecution in the north, and we are particularly happy that you are here today because you are able to join your son.

Your son is well known to us, and we share your pride in him. Four years ago he captured the imagination of the free world by his daring exploit. It was he who flew a Russian MIG airplane from its base in North Korea to freedom in South Korea. For that feat he was granted a reward by our Air Force of \$100,000. But it is significant that, when your son started his flight for freedom,

he didn't know of this reward. He was fleeing from Communist tyranny to seek freedom in the south. His was the thrust for freedom which has characterized so many of those who have fled from Communist-dominated lands. And there was another reason for his coming—a reason which always can fill our hearts: Your son flew to South Korea for there he hoped that he could find his mother. It is particularly fitting, therefore, that we can now reward his bravery, as it should most appropriately be rewarded, by bringing his mother to this country to join him.

We are able to do so because under the new law that Congress passed in the last session,¹ we are now able to reunite split families. In most cases these are families that have been split by reason of the Refugee Relief Act because only part of the family was hitherto eligible to enter the United States. Under this humane provision you, Mrs. Saing Kun Ko, are the first Asian and the first escapee from communism to come to the United States. Your arrival today is symbolic of what we are now able to do on a limited basis to reunite families in freedom.

So good luck to you, Mrs. Saing Kun Ko, and may your life in America hold for you all the joys of freedom and of happiness of a united family which has for so long been denied you.

REMARKS BY MR. MCCOLLUM

Press release 612 dated November 4

It is a particular pleasure to welcome you today because very few people in the world have made as great a contribution to freedom in recent years as the Republic of Korea. You come directly from a land devoted to liberty to our own Republic.

However, in 1951 you accompanied the U.N. forces south from a land that had been taken over by tyranny and terror—North Korea. We and our soldiers who fought as allies of your countrymen share some knowledge of that tyranny in North Korea.

Your arrival here as the first escapee under the new immigration program is particularly pertinent because you come in to join your son, who had the courage to turn his back upon the service of

¹ For a statement by President Eisenhower on Sept. 11, 1957, regarding the amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act, see BULLETIN of Sept. 30, 1957, p. 543.

Communist tyranny. He discovered the loss of human rights and dignity which this service involved and flew his MIG fighter south to freedom 2 years after you, yourself, had reached it. Your son has been in the United States since 1953, and it now gives us great pleasure to be able to welcome you as you join him.

Despite all the distortions of Communist propaganda, this country warmly welcomes those of worth who escape from Communist oppression and totalitarian tyranny. We are most happy to have you here with us, and I hope that you will call on my office for any aid or assistance at any time.

Mohammed V, King of Morocco To Visit United States

The Department of State announced on November 4 (press release 610) that arrangements have been made for the reception of His Majesty, Mohammed V, King of Morocco, who will visit the United States November 25–December 10, 1957, at the invitation of President Eisenhower. This is the King's first visit to this country.

His Majesty will arrive at Washington on November 25. He will remain in Washington until November 28, when he and his party will fly to Williamsburg, Va., to begin their tour of the United States.

After Williamsburg the King will visit Dallas, the King Ranch at Kingsville, Tex., Los Angeles, San Francisco, Omaha, Niagara Falls, and New York City. He will return to Morocco by plane, leaving New York on December 10.

Civil Aviation Discussions With Scandinavian Countries

Press release 606 dated October 31

Civil aviation discussions will begin on November 6, 1957, in Washington between the United States and Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Henry T. Snowdon, Chief, Aviation Division, Department of State, will act as chairman of the U.S. delegation, and Ambassador Henrik de Kauffmann of Denmark will serve as chairman of the joint Scandinavian group.

Under the provisions of the air transport services agreements with Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, designated airlines of those countries are authorized to operate to New York and Chicago while U.S. airlines, in turn, are authorized to provide service to Scandinavian points, including Copenhagen, Oslo, and Stockholm, and points beyond. In addition, by an exchange of notes of August 6, 1954,¹ reciprocal rights were exchanged for an experimental period of 3 years for the operation of a so-called polar route from Scandinavia to Los Angeles. Scandinavian Airlines System, the carrier designated jointly by the three Scandinavian Governments to operate the routes authorized under the three agreements, commenced commercial operations over the polar route on November 15, 1954, on the basis of a provisional permit issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The forthcoming discussions will be directed at an examination of the operating experience of Scandinavian Airlines System over the route to Los Angeles with subsequent consideration of the Scandinavian request that the route exchanged on a temporary basis in 1954 be made a permanent part of the route annexes of the air transport services agreements through amendment of those agreements.

Progress Under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

*Statement by Thomas C. Mann
Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs²*

May I begin, Mr. Chairman, by reading a message from President Eisenhower relating to the 10th anniversary of the signing of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which we will celebrate next Wednesday, the 30th of October:

Please give my greetings to all attending the 12th session of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Over the past 10 years, the General Agreement has steadily grown in importance and value until it stands

¹ BULLETIN of Aug. 16, 1954, p. 251.

² Made at the 12th session of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva, Switzerland, on Oct. 28 (press release 602 dated Oct. 29). For an announcement of the U. S. delegation, see BULLETIN of Nov. 11, 1957, p. 768.

today as a major instrument for world trade cooperation.

On this occasion I am glad to join in paying tribute to those who have worked so effectively through GATT for the expansion of international trade and for the solution of our common trade problems.

Strengthened by a growing tradition of worldwide service, the General Agreement will enjoy continuing progress. Congratulations and best wishes.

I am sure that all of us, in appraising the past accomplishments of the General Agreement, will immediately call to mind the fact that our successful collaboration over the years has owed much to our Executive Secretary, Mr. Eric Wyndham White, and his staff. On this occasion, I would like to express to him the thanks of the United States delegation for all that he has so effectively done to further the objectives of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The General Agreement is continuing to move forward. It is becoming more firmly established. It is broadening its membership. It is operating more effectively.

The substantive amendments to the basic trading rules of the General Agreement, which are designed to strengthen and improve its operation, have recently entered into force for two-thirds of the Contracting Parties, including the United States, and we hope will soon enter into force for all of the other Contracting Parties.

Membership in GATT continues to grow. At this 12th session we are welcoming into our ranks, as full Contracting Parties, the newly independent countries of Ghana and the Federation of Malaya. During the past year, also, the participation of Japan in the General Agreement has widened with the establishment of GATT relationships between Japan and Brazil. It is our earnest wish that additional Contracting Parties will be able to assume GATT relations with Japan in the near future. Switzerland is in process of acceding to the General Agreement, and I am sure that all of us take great pleasure in looking forward to the occasion when Swiss accession will be complete.

Balance-of-Payments Consultations

The criticism has sometimes been voiced that the Contracting Parties have been too much concerned with tariff problems and have given too little attention to the removal of other barriers to trade. The experience we have gained this

year with the balance-of-payment consultations² which, for the first time, were conducted at the invitation of the Contracting Parties on a comprehensive basis, should help to answer this criticism. These consultations have stimulated governments to undertake a genuine reexamination of their systems of quantitative restrictions with a view to relaxing them wherever possible. In a number of cases it has found that substantial liberalizing measures could be taken without the serious consequences which had sometimes been feared. The consultations have provided an opportunity to discuss the effects on the trade of exporting countries of the restrictions still in force. They have also provided an opportunity for countries in balance-of-payments difficulties to explain the export and other problems they must overcome in achieving a position that will permit the full liberalization of their trade.

We have, in addition, gained valuable experience which should help us in carrying forward the systematic consultations on balance-of-payments restrictions under the new and improved trade rules which have just entered into force. All in all, the Contracting Parties can take satisfaction in having made a notable contribution to the common objectives of the General Agreement and the International Monetary Fund of freeing international trade from restrictions imposed on balance-of-payments grounds.

The Executive Secretary has suggested that during the meetings being held this week those of us who wish to do so should comment on prospective developments with respect to the future of the General Agreement. In the United States the legislative authority for participation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has been the Trade Agreements Act. Under this legislation, which was first enacted over 23 years ago and which has been periodically extended by the Congress on nine occasions, the President of the United States has been authorized to enter into agreements for the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade on a reciprocal and mutually advantageous basis. The authority of the United States to carry out new tariff negotiations after June 30th of next year will depend upon further appropriate action by the Congress.

The executive branch favors the extension of the Trade Agreements Act and believes that the life

² *Ibid.*, July 22, 1957, p. 153.

of the trade agreements program should be extended by the Congress for a sufficient period to provide stability to the program as well as adequate authority to consolidate and expand the gains that have been made in world trade.

The effectiveness of the General Agreement would, we believe, be greatly increased by the establishment of the Organization for Trade Cooperation which is provided for in the agreement drawn up by the Contracting Parties in 1955. Accordingly, my Government will again recommend that the Congress authorize the participation of the United States in the OTC.

World Economic Trends

The activities of the Contracting Parties are, of course, directly affected by world economic trends. Once again world output and consumption have increased and international trade has reached new records. Both the industrialized and less developed areas have participated in this expansion, although to different degrees. Some of the less developed areas, for example, have outpaced highly industrialized areas in rates of growth, while growth in other less developed areas has not increased as fast. Also, as has been pointed out in the secretariat's interesting report on international trade, 1956, there has been an apparent tendency for the international trade of the newly industrializing areas to increase at a slower rate as the industrialization of those areas proceeds and shifts take place in the output of primary commodities. Such adjustments are to be expected in a dynamic world. What is important is that the main trend toward increased growth and productivity in all areas, coupled with the maximum practicable freedom of trade, be continued.

Perhaps the most pervading economic problem today is that of inflation. This has not been confined to any one area. In the United States, after 3 years of relative stability, the cost of living increased 2 percent in 1956 and has continued to increase in 1957. It has also risen, often by greater percentages, in every Western European country and in most other countries of the world.

Clearly, inflation, if not checked, can undermine economic strength and growth and lead to the deterioration of international trade. Fortunately, most governments have been acutely aware of these dangers. More important, deter-

mined steps are being taken to bring inflation under control through measures which do not involve rigid economic controls and regimentation.

As we all know, there have been certain strains in the balance of payments of some countries during the past year. In some countries these strains have resulted from a rapid expansion in international demand leading to heavy imports from foreign sources generally. In others, temporary factors have been responsible for sudden demands on monetary reserves. During this period the United States has continued to supply, through current payments for goods and services, government expenditures abroad, and United States private investment, a large flow of dollar outpayments to the rest of the world. During the year ending June 30, 1957, the total of such payments reached a record of \$27.2 billion, which was substantially in excess of foreign purchases of goods and services from the United States. During this period, also, the United States has cooperated through the International Monetary Fund and the Export-Import Bank in helping other countries to adopt effective programs for overcoming balance-of-payments difficulties and achieving monetary stabilization.

This year, as in the past two sessions, the delegation of the United States will present information to the Contracting Parties regarding its program for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities. At this time I wish to emphasize a few central points in connection with this program. The first is that United States agricultural surpluses have in fact been put to highly constructive uses in many parts of the world, especially in underdeveloped areas confronted with balance-of-payments difficulties which have precluded them from buying commercially all of the agricultural products which their people want and need. The second is that, in carrying forward this program, we have done our best to avoid any undue disruption to prices and markets for commercial trade, including the commercial trade of other exporting countries. I believe that we have largely succeeded in our efforts. In particular, the prices of the major internationally traded farm exports which move in greatest volume under our programs have been very stable in the past 2 years. For the future we will continue to exercise care to assure that our surpluses will enter into increased consumption as much as pos-

sible a
as pos
The
which
prices
econ
expor
prepa
lems.
trol o

Europe

In t
Gover
consis
nomic
the sig
treaty
munit
This
and a
lation

The
treaty
Agree
at th
Parti
it is
of the
devel

Ho
First,
that t
have
aims
of bot
to pr
tions,
to sti
comp
by be
Rome
fore,
econ
ter lif

Th
and u
now
West
endor
a con

Nov

sible and will disturb commercial markets as little as possible.

The United States recognizes the problems which may arise from excessive fluctuations in the prices of primary products for countries whose economies depend largely on the production and export of such products. The United States is prepared to meet and discuss commodity problems. However, we do not favor extensive control of commodity trade and prices.

European Economic Community

In the several international forums in which my Government has the opportunity to speak, it has consistently supported the objective of the economic integration of Western Europe. Now, with the signing at Rome, in March of this year, of the treaty establishing the European Economic Community, an important milestone has been reached. This is an event of major historical importance and a development in international economic relations of the greatest potential significance.

The six governments signatories of the Rome treaty are also Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. So that now, at the first annual session of the Contracting Parties following the signing of the Rome treaty, it is appropriate that we begin our consideration of the new trade relationships which are about to develop.

How should we approach these relationships? First, let us all recognize the fundamental fact that the General Agreement and the Rome treaty have common and mutually reinforcing aims—aims which are clearly reflected in the language of both of these basic instruments. These aims are to promote closer economic relations among nations, to reduce barriers to international trade, and to stimulate economic growth, productivity, and competitive enterprise within a free society, linked by bonds of friendship and cooperation. The Rome treaty and the General Agreement, therefore, are companions on the road to improved economic relationships between nations and a better life for their peoples.

The Rome treaty seeks to place on a common and unified basis, over a transitional period, the now separate economies of the six countries of Western Europe. The General Agreement both endorses this objective and provides the basis for a continuing expansion of trade on a mutually

advantageous basis between those six countries and other Contracting Parties. The foundations, therefore, are clear. They are foundations on which can be built the full development of both the European Economic Community and the GATT community.

It is obvious that, as progress is made in the merging of six separate economies into one, problems will arise in trade relationships between the six countries and other Contracting Parties to the General Agreement. This is only natural and, indeed, inevitable. Our objective should be not to suppress these problems, which might then give birth to greater ones, but to examine them frankly and to seek solutions which will give confidence to all Contracting Parties that future relationships will grow in ways which will both further the creation of the European Economic Community and expand international trade among that very large segment of the world which is represented by the Contracting Parties. My Government, Mr. Chairman, is prepared to cooperate wholeheartedly in this endeavor.

GATT Amendments Become Effective

Press release 598 dated October 28

The Department of State has been informed that the protocol amending the preamble and parts II and III of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) dated March 10, 1955, became effective as between those countries accepting the protocol on October 7, 1957.

The protocol provides that the amendments shall become effective upon acceptance by two-thirds of the Contracting Parties to the GATT for those countries accepting the protocol. The United States accepted the protocol in March 1955, subject to the same qualification as previously existed with respect to application to the fullest extent not inconsistent with legislation which existed on October 30, 1947.

The amendments to the GATT which now are effective were negotiated at the ninth session of the Contracting Parties in 1954-55.¹ The principal changes are as follows:

¹ For more detailed information regarding the amendments, see *The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)*, Department of State publication 5813, April 1955.

(1) The balance-of-payments provisions contained in articles XII and XIV are strengthened by a requirement that import restrictions maintained for financial reasons be reviewed at regular intervals (i. e., annually or, in the case of underdeveloped countries, every other year) and that, whenever a significant deviation from the provisions of GATT is found, action to secure compliance be taken.

(2) Standards on the use of export subsidies are provided for the first time in article XVI. They are designed to prevent increased use of such subsidies for manufactured products and to prevent use of such subsidies in agricultural products to the point of gaining a more than equitable share of the world export trade.

(3) Article XVII involving state-trading enterprises takes account of the fact that these enterprises may be operated so as to create obstacles to trade and that negotiations to eliminate or reduce such obstacles are important to the expansion of international trade. Reporting procedures are established to obtain necessary information about the operations of state-trading enterprises maintained by Contracting Parties.

(4) A new article on assistance to economic development replaces the former article XVIII. It provides more expeditious procedures which an underdeveloped country may invoke to increase tariffs or apply nondiscriminatory import quotas to assist the establishment of a new industry. With regard to tariff-concession items, there are special procedures to safeguard the interests of affected countries.

(5) The continued stability of the tariff concessions is assured by changing article XXVIII to provide that the concessions will be automatically continued for consecutive periods of moderate duration (normally 3 years) whenever one period ends. Before the beginning of each new period, governments will be able to renegotiate individual concessions. For the necessary flexibility, authorization is provided under certain limitations for renegotiations of concessions at any time, if special circumstances require such action.

The general provisions of GATT were initially divided into a preamble and three parts: Part I (articles I and II) gives legal effect to the schedules of tariff concessions and lays down the basic rule of nondiscrimination in tariff and customs matters generally. The amendments to part I

and articles XXIX and XXX do not become effective until they are accepted by all the Contracting Parties to the GATT. Part II (articles III-XXIII) dealt with trade barriers other than tariffs, including quotas, internal taxes, customs formalities, etc. The amendments to these articles became effective on October 7, 1957. Part III dealt with procedural matters, such as the application and administration of the agreement, its entry into force and amendment, the accession of new parties, the withdrawal from the agreement, etc. The amendments to all these articles in part III, except a new article XXIX pertaining to tariff negotiations and article XXX pertaining to the procedure for amending the agreement, also became effective on October 7, 1957.

The following Contracting Parties have accepted the protocol putting into effect as between themselves the amended portions of the GATT described above:

Australia	India
Austria	Indonesia
Burma	Japan
Canada	Malaya
Cuba	New Zealand
Czechoslovakia	Nicaragua
Denmark	Norway
Federal Republic of Germany	Pakistan
Finland	Rhodesia and Nyasaland
France	Sweden
Ghana	Union of South Africa
Greece	United Kingdom
Haiti	United States

Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Five Countries

Press release 620 dated November 8

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

The Committee for Reciprocity Information is requesting views from interested persons on certain additional matters which have arisen in connection with limited tariff negotiations with Canada, Ceylon, Finland, Greece, and the Union of South Africa under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). A list of products on which views are requested is attached. No United States tariff reductions are involved.

On September 16, 1957, the Committee for Reciprocity Information announced United States participation in tariff negotiations at Geneva arising from the desire of Austria, Canada, Ceylon, Greece, and the Union of South Africa to modify or withdraw certain of their GATT concessions.¹ Since then Finland has submitted a list of concessions on which it wishes to negotiate modifications or withdrawals. Also, Canada and Greece have added some items to their earlier notification, and Ceylon has modified its notification by removing one item (razor blades) and adding another (nylon piece goods). In the earlier announcement, one item (combs) was omitted from the list of items on which the Union of South Africa wishes to negotiate.

The countries listed in the two announcements are among those which have expressed a desire to avail themselves of the opportunity, on January 1, 1958, to modify or withdraw concessions in their schedules to the general agreement. Certain countries, however, including a few with which the United States has entered into discussions, are unable, because of domestic procedural requirements, to make public information as to proposed tariff changes until they are given effect. Information concerning such negotiations will be made public as soon as the necessary arrangements can be made.

Under procedures established by the Contracting Parties to the general agreement, the country proposing to modify or withdraw a concession negotiates, with respect to compensation, with the country with which the concession was originally negotiated and with any other country having a principal supplying interest. In these negotiations new concessions may be granted by the country proposing the modification or withdrawal. If agreement is not reached on this basis, the countries adversely affected may withdraw or adjust upward concessions of a value substantially equivalent to the concession modified or withdrawn.

In addition to these negotiations the country proposing modification or withdrawal of concessions consults with other countries substantially interested in the concessions. In participating in renegotiations the United States endeavors to keep withdrawals and modifications to a minimum in

order to maintain at the highest possible level the balance of mutually advantageous concessions.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information is an interagency group which receives views of interested persons regarding proposed or existing trade agreements. The committee consists of a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission and representatives from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Interior, Labor, State, and Treasury, and the International Cooperation Administration.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information would welcome views from interested parties with regard to the possible effect on United States trade of modification or withdrawal of the concessions on the items in the attached list. In addition, the committee invites the submission of views regarding concessions which the United States might seek from the respective countries as compensation. Although discussions are already in progress among the various countries, the United States will not conclude agreements until there has been an opportunity to appraise the information and views submitted in response to this announcement.

Views on the foregoing matters should be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information by the close of business on December 6, 1957. All communications, in 15 copies, should be addressed to: The Secretary of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, Washington 25, D. C.

If any interested party considers that his views cannot be adequately expressed to the committee in a written brief, he should make this known to the secretary of the committee, who will then arrange for oral presentation before the committee.

LIST OF ITEMS

Additional GATT Concessions Proposed for Modification or Withdrawal by Canada, Ceylon, Finland, Greece, and Union of South Africa in Which the United States Has an Interest

Canada

Primary zinc and zinc products, including the following categories:

dust

spelter

pigs, blocks, slabs, plates, rods, bars, dross and scrap

zinc alloys containing not more than 10% by weight of other metal or metals in the form of pigs, slabs,

¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 7, 1957, p. 581

blocks, dust or granular, foil, ribbon, strip, sheet, plate, discs or slugs
plates for marine boilers
sheets for lithography and photo-engravers
coated zinc forms
slugs or discs for use in the manufacture of seamless cups or shells for electric dry batteries
other zinc manufactures

Ceylon

Nylon piece goods

Finland

Fresh apples (imported December 1 to June 15)

Soya-beans

Soya-bean oil

Lard

Assembled switchboards

Apparatus and parts for telegraph and telephone installations

Greece

Patent leather

Kipskins and calfskins simply oiled, colored, or otherwise prepared

Union of South Africa

Combs

President Places Tariff Quota on Almond Imports

White House press release dated October 23

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

The President on October 23 issued a proclamation imposing a 1-year tariff quota on imports of shelled or prepared almonds. The proclamation provides for a fee of 10 cents per pound on imports in excess of 5 million pounds during the period beginning October 23, 1957, and ending September 30, 1958. In taking this action the President accepted the finding of a majority of the U.S. Tariff Commission that import restrictions are necessary to fulfill the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

The Tariff Commission reported on September 23, 1957, that it did not agree on the necessity for limiting imports in this case.¹ Two members of the Commission concluded that import restrictions were unnecessary. The majority of the Commis-

¹ Copies of the Commission's report may be obtained from the U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington 25, D. C.

sion recommended a tariff quota of 3.5 million pounds.

The President had requested this investigation on June 27, 1957.² The Commission's investigation and report were made pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, which authorizes limitations on imports when imports are interfering with or threaten to interfere with domestic price-support or marketing-order programs.

PROCLAMATION 3209³

IMPOSING A FEE ON IMPORTS OF ALMONDS

WHEREAS, pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 624), the Secretary of Agriculture advised me there was reason to believe that shelled almonds and blanched, roasted, or otherwise prepared or preserved almonds are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the marketing-order program of the Department of Agriculture, under Federal Marketing Order No. 9, with respect to almonds, or to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestically produced almonds with respect to which such program of the Department of Agriculture is being undertaken; and

WHEREAS, on June 27, 1957, under the authority of the said section 22, I caused the United States Tariff Commission to make an investigation with respect to this matter; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the said section 22, as implemented by Executive Order No. 7233 of November 23, 1935, the said Commission has made such investigation and has reported to me its findings and recommendations made in connection therewith; and

WHEREAS, on the basis of the said investigation and report of the Tariff Commission, I find that shelled almonds and blanched, roasted, or otherwise prepared or preserved almonds (not including almond paste) are practically certain to be imported into the United States during the period from October 1, 1957, to September 30, 1958, both dates inclusive, under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the said program of the Department of Agriculture; and

WHEREAS I find and declare that the import fee hereinafter proclaimed is shown by such investigation of the said Commission to be necessary in order that the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of the said products will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the said program of the Department of Agriculture:

² BULLETIN of July 29, 1957, p. 210.

³ 22 Fed. Reg. 8725.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the said section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, do proclaim that shelled almonds and blanched, roasted, or otherwise prepared or preserved almonds (not including almond paste) entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the period from October 23, 1957, to September 30, 1958, both dates inclusive, in excess of an aggregate quantity of five million pounds, shall be subject to a fee of ten cents per pound but not more than fifty per centum ad valorem. Such fee shall be in addition to any other duties imposed upon the importation of such almonds.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twenty-third day of October in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred [SEAL] and fifty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-second.



By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.

Tariff Commission's Report on Dried Figs and Fig Paste

White House press release dated October 23

The President today accepted the U.S. Tariff Commission's report on dried figs and fig paste.¹ The President's action was based upon the Commission's investigation and upon its determinations of fact reported on September 17, 1957. The Tariff Commission found, with two members dissenting, that import restrictions were not warranted under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

On July 19, 1957, the President requested the Tariff Commission to investigate the need for import restrictions.² The Commission's investigation and report were made under section 22, which authorizes the limitation of imports in order to prevent material interference with the Department of Agriculture's price-support or marketing-order programs.

¹ Copies of the Commission's report may be obtained from the U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington 25, D. C.

² BULLETIN of Aug. 5, 1957, p. 242.

The President also approved the Tariff Commission's unanimous finding under Executive Order 10401 that no formal investigation should be instituted at this time to determine whether the tariff should be reduced on imports of dried figs. The Commission found that there is not sufficient reason at this time to reopen the 1952 escape-clause action³ which resulted in an increase in the duty on imports of dried figs. The President's decision means that the existing rate of duty will continue to apply without reduction or other modification. Executive Order 10401 requires the periodic review of affirmative actions taken under the escape clause. This was the Tariff Commission's fifth such review of the dried-fig tariff.

World Bank Reports Net Income of \$10.1 Million for Quarter

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development reported on November 3 a net income of \$10.1 million for the 3 months ending September 30, 1957, compared with \$8.2 million for the same period in 1956.

This income was placed in the supplemental reserve against losses on loans and guaranties and raised the reserve to \$204.9 million. Loan commissions amounted to \$4.6 million and were credited to the bank's special reserve, increasing that reserve to \$98.3 million. Total reserves on September 30, 1957, were thus \$303.2 million.

Gross income, exclusive of loan commissions, was \$22.2 million, compared with \$17 million in the corresponding quarter of 1956. Expenses for the 3-month period totaled \$12.1 million.

The bank made 11 loans totaling \$214.3 million—the largest total lent in any quarter since the bank began lending for development. Disbursements on loans were \$119.3 million, making total disbursements \$2,415.3 million on September 30.

Repayments of principal received by the bank amounted to \$6.4 million.

Ghana, Ireland, Saudi Arabia, and Sudan became members of the bank during the quarter. Their capital stock subscriptions were: Ghana, \$15 million; Ireland, \$30 million; Saudi Arabia and Sudan, \$10 million each. At September 30, the bank had 64 member countries and total subscribed capital of \$9,333.4 million.

³ *Ibid.*, Sept. 1, 1952, p. 337.

Question of Admission of Korea and Viet-Nam to Membership in the United Nations

*Statement by Genoa S. Washington
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly*¹

Several delegates, principally those from the Soviet bloc, have raised questions concerning Outer Mongolia and the North Korean and North Viet-Nam regimes. The opposition of the United States to the admission of Outer Mongolia and of the North Korean and North Viet-Nam regimes is well known. It has nothing to do with what the Soviets choose to call their social structure. The opposition of the United States to the admission of Outer Mongolia and to any recognition of the authorities in North Korea and North Viet-Nam by the United Nations is based on article 4 of the charter.

We do not regard Outer Mongolia as possessing the attributes of sovereignty under generally recognized principles of international law. The United Nations itself has decided that the Government of the Republic of Korea is the only legally constituted government in Korea. The North Korean regime has no standing at all. North Viet-Nam has never been regarded by any United Nations body as possessing the qualifications of membership, and in view of its violent history it is hard to consider it "peace-loving" under the requirements of article 4 of the charter.

The charter provides that membership is open to "states," that these states must be "peace-loving," that they must accept the obligations contained in the charter, and that in the judgment of the United Nations they must be able and willing to carry out these obligations. Even if these applicants were qualified in every other respect—which they are not—we are not con-

vinced that they possess the initial prerequisite of statehood. The history of United Nations action on this question shows that this view is predominant in the United Nations.

I would point out to the representative of the U.S.S.R. who has referred to the division of Korea and of Viet-Nam that this tragic division is in each case being perpetuated by the deliberate policies of the U.S.S.R. and of the Chinese Communists. They have pursued their policies through the use of force and in disregard of the attitudes of the overwhelming majority of the United Nations.

Viet Minh Invasion of Laos

The Communist regime in North Viet-Nam clearly fails to fulfill the conditions laid down in article 4 of the charter. Its history clearly shows that it has demonstrated neither a love of peace nor a willingness to accept the obligations arising out of the charter. It is a historical fact that in April 1953 the Communist Viet Minh forces openly invaded the territory of the Kingdom of Laos and on the 19th of that month seized the Lao town of Xieng Khouang. In December 1953 the Viet Minh armed forces again invaded the territory of the Kingdom of Laos and on the 26th of that month entered the town of Thakhek. In 1954 the Viet Minh armed forces yet again invaded the territory of the Kingdom of Laos.

During the years after the signing of the Geneva accords the Viet Minh Communists continued flagrant interference in the internal affairs of Laos. In declarations last year the Prime Minister of Laos cited acts of interference by North Viet-Nam which contradicted the declarations by the latter of its adherence to the principles of

¹ Made in the Special Political Committee on Oct. 16 (U.S. delegation press release 2772/Rev. 1) during debate on the admission of new members.

international policy recommended by Pandit Nehru. Most serious of these acts of interference are constituted by the presence in Laos of Communist Viet Minh cadres, who form the backbone of the Pathet Lao units, and by the supply of these units with arms and ammunition introduced continually from North Viet-Nam into Laos since the putting into application of the Geneva accords.

While, on the one hand, the military potential of free Viet-Nam has been drastically reduced by the withdrawal of nearly 200,000 members of the French Expeditionary Corps and by the reduction of the Vietnamese Army by more than 50,000 as well as by the outshipment from Viet-Nam since the cessation of hostilities of well over \$200 million worth of war equipment, we have, on the other hand, reports of steady, constant growth of the warmaking potential of the Communists north of the 17th parallel.

In complete disregard of their obligations under the Geneva accords, whose provisions they solemnly undertook to be bound by, the Vietnamese Communists have imported voluminous quantities of arms across the Chinese border and have imported a constant stream of Chinese Communist military personnel.

As eloquently stated by the British Government in a diplomatic note sent to Moscow in April 1956:

The Viet Minh army has been so greatly strengthened by the embodiment and the re-equipment of irregular forces that instead of the seven Viet Minh divisions in existence in July 1954 there are now not less than 20.

This striking contrast of military expansion in the north and the withdrawal and reduction of military forces in the south speaks for itself.

Refugees from Quynh Luu Village, Nghe An Province, who fled to Tourane by boat and thence to Saigon by plane, said on November 20, 1956, that after reading Ho Chi Minh's decree promising rectification of the abuses of the Communist "land reform" program, they thought they were free to go south. They applied to the International Control Commission for permission to depart, but Communist troops poured into the area and announced that no one was free to go south. Fighting broke out between the people and Communist troops. Communist officials accompanied by troops then entered the area to "explain" the land-reform program. On November 12, 1956, villagers captured some of these officials and

troops and seized their arms. The next day more Communist officials arrived and were met by a mass of some 3,000 people. Villagers seized more officials and soldiers. Meanwhile, demonstrations broke out in other villages. On the following day the Communist regime brought in some 5,000-7,000 troops with armed cars and light and heavy weapons and engaged about 12,000 people armed only with sticks and stones. Before the fight ended, several hundred persons had been injured and a number killed. The Communist radio on November 20 and 21 admitted that these uprisings were the result of crimes and mistakes committed by the regime.

Thus, the Nghe An uprisings clearly illustrated the Vietnamese Communist regime's disregard for human rights.

The Communist Record in Korea

The Communist record in Korea shows even more contempt for the principles of the United Nations. From 1945 to 1950 the U.S.S.R. systematically blocked Korean unification. In 1950, observing the rapid development and progress of the Republic of Korea with the aid of the United Nations, the Communist rulers of North Korea, encouraged and abetted by the Soviet Union, launched an aggressive attack against the Republic of Korea in an effort to bring about by lightning use of armed force the control they had otherwise failed to achieve. It took 3 years and the lives of many United Nations soldiers to repel the North Korean aggression and the subsequent Chinese Communist aggression. The United Nations condemned the North Korean regime and the Chinese Communists as aggressors, fought to repel this aggression, and has consistently sought the peaceful unification of Korea. The attitude of defiance and abuse of the United Nations by the North Korean regime scarcely commends it for membership in the organization.

I do not wish here to enter further into a discussion of the unification problem but shall have comments on that subject to make when the Korean item is taken up.

Because of the refusal of the U.S.S.R. to discuss a settlement of the Korean problem based on United Nations principles, the military armistice that ended active hostilities is all that exists. The Soviet representative has charged the United Nations Command with violation of that agreement. The facts show that it is the North Koreans

and Chinese Communists who have violated the armistice. They refused to allow any bona fide inspection in North Korea. They introduced modern weapons and aircraft on a large scale into North Korea. The action taken by the United Nations Command in response to these violations was legally justified, and was fully reported to the United Nations.² The Communists still refuse to account for prisoners of war, as they were required to do by the armistice. Chinese Communist troops remain in North Korea in defiance of the United Nations.

I would like to point out to the representative of the U.S.S.R. that no applicant has ever been denied admission to the United Nations by a United States veto in the Security Council. Many eligible states, on the other hand, were excluded from membership for as long as 10 years by Soviet vetoes. The record starts in 1946 and continues through 1957. It reads as follows: Jordan, 4 Soviet vetoes; Portugal, 4 Soviet vetoes; Ireland, 4 Soviet vetoes; Italy, 6 Soviet vetoes; Austria, 3 Soviet vetoes; Finland, 3 Soviet vetoes; Ceylon, 4 Soviet vetoes; Republic of Korea, 3 Soviet vetoes; Nepal, 2 Soviet vetoes; Libya, 2 Soviet vetoes; Japan, 4 Soviet vetoes; Viet-Nam, 3 Soviet vetoes; Laos, 2 Soviet vetoes; Cambodia, 2 Soviet vetoes; Spain, 1 Soviet veto. Total Soviet vetoes on membership to date: 47.

The U.S.S.R. continues to view membership applications from the standpoint of political bargaining and without regard to charter criteria for admission. Last year in this Committee the U.S.S.R. attempted to link the admission of the Republic of Korea and of Viet-Nam with that of North Korea and of North Viet-Nam; it followed the same line in the Security Council just last month on the Republic of Korea. They have done this in disregard of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which declared in 1948: "The provisions of article 4 of the charter necessarily imply that every application for admission should be examined and voted on separately and on its own merits."

U.S. Views on Admission of New Members

Mr. Chairman, the United States is guided by three principles on the admission of new members:

² For text of a special report by the Unified Command in Korea, see BULLETIN of Sept. 2, 1957, p. 393.

1. To bring into membership all qualified states that apply;

2. To follow the provisions of the charter in judging the qualifications of applicants;

3. To avoid thwarting the will of a qualified majority by use on this issue of the veto in the Security Council, a voting privilege given to five nations in the expectation that it would only be used in exceptional circumstances.

It is clear that the course of wisdom for this Committee will be to endorse the two resolutions sponsored by the 13 powers.³ The United Nations has repeatedly found the Republic of Korea and Viet-Nam qualified. It should do so again.

Holding this opinion, we cannot support the resolution put forward by India and Indonesia.⁴ This resolution is identical with one placed before this Committee last year. The effect of the resolution, as was made clear both this year and last, would be to imply that the General Assembly places all applicants on the same basis. It is therefore in direct conflict with the intent of the 13-power resolution. The General Assembly, in asking the Security Council to reconsider the applications of the Republic of Korea and Viet-Nam in the light of the General Assembly's endorsement, specifically requested a report from the Council. It should now take cognizance of what has happened and reiterate its longstanding position on these applicants.

We hope the Committee will share our views by voting for the resolutions contained in documents A/SPC/L. 15 and A/SPC/L. 16 and against the resolution contained in document A/SPC/L. 17.⁵

³ U.N. docs. A/SPC/L. 15 and Add. 1 and 2, and A/SPC/L. 16 and Add. 1 and 2, noting with regret the continued inability of the Security Council to recommend the admission of the Republic of Korea and Viet-Nam to membership in the United Nations because of the Soviet vetoes and reaffirming the view that those states are "fully qualified for and should be admitted to membership."

⁴ U. N. doc. A/SPC/L. 17.

⁵ On Oct. 17 the Committee rejected the resolution contained in U.N. doc. A/SPC/L. 17 and adopted the resolutions on the Republic of Korea and Viet-Nam. On Oct. 25 the General Assembly in plenary session adopted the resolution on the Republic of Korea by a vote of 51 to 9 (Soviet bloc) with 21 abstentions and the resolution on Viet-Nam by a vote of 49 to 9 (Soviet bloc) with 23 abstentions (A/Res/1144 (XII) A and B).

Using Atomic Energy for the Benefit of Mankind

Remarks by Robert M. McKinney¹

My country and, I believe, the world have been inspired by the events that have taken place in this hall during these past 2 weeks. Here in Vienna, whose culture has ennobled mankind for so many generations, an effective beginning has been made on building that road which may become the world's avenue to peace and better life.

Undiminished by the tedious practicalities on which we necessarily have been laboring, our hearts beat stronger by the realization that, in this hall, 57 sovereign nations are succeeding through cooperation, sacrifice, and understanding in bringing into being the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The inspiration of the nations assembled here is indeed the greater because of our realization of the difficulties and heavy responsibilities which, in the years ahead, face this organization. For it is in the realization of the gravity of the problems ahead that we gain our determination to build solidly and wisely so that we may be able to accomplish the great tasks to which we have set ourselves.

We have no precedents. The problems we face have never existed before, and their solution will challenge our intelligence and the most patient understanding which we can bring to bear. Progress may be slow, although the need for our success is urgent.

Thus, while we are inspired in our contemplation of the almost boundless possibilities which

the peaceful uses of atomic energy offer the world, we must recognize that much hard work on practical problems will have to be done in the years ahead. As we face the tasks before us, we can take encouragement from the progress which has been achieved in the past few years in using atomic energy for the benefit of mankind.

Let us pause on this day—October 11, 1957—and consider what the situation was in 1953 when President Eisenhower proposed the creation of this Agency. Postwar efforts for international agreement in the atomic-energy field had reached an impasse. Exchange of scientific information, so vital to scientific progress, was limited. The development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy was mainly confined to four or five nations, and there was little prospect of spreading the peaceful uses of the atom without at the same time spreading the capacity to make nuclear war.

Progress Through Cooperative Effort

What is our situation today? Today, Mr. President, we have a statute ratified by 57 nations.² Our statute, so carefully negotiated, incorporates the views and aspirations of more than 82 sovereign peoples. This statute provides for safeguards against the diversion of atomic assistance to military uses and makes it possible for suppliers to make materials available to other governments with confidence that these materials will be used solely for peaceful purposes. As a result of President Eisenhower's offer to make available 5,000 kilograms of uranium 235 and to match the offers of others, and as a result of there being made available to the Agency 100,000 kilograms of natural uranium by Portugal, and the

¹ Made at the first regular session of the general conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency at Vienna, Austria, on Oct. 11. Mr. McKinney was an alternate U.S. representative to the conference and is the representative of the United States on the Board of Governors of the IAEA. For text of remarks by Lewis L. Strauss at the opening session on Oct. 1, see *BULLETIN* of Oct. 21, 1957, p. 637.

² *Ibid.*, Nov. 19, 1956, p. 813.

offer of 50 kilograms of uranium 235 by the Soviet Union, the Agency now has the means with which it can begin its programs, although of course it will require much more material to support an expanding development of nuclear power.

In the field of information, a broad international exchange through the entire range of atomic science became a reality at the 1955 International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Geneva.³

My Government regards the exchange of information, through conferences of this type and through such other practical means as may be available, as essential to the achievement of the Agency's objectives. We expect that the second Geneva conference in September 1958 will be equally successful. It is the view of my Government that the Agency should schedule and sponsor future conferences of this type.

The exchange of scientific information, fortunately, did not end in 1955 at Geneva. Since the first Geneva conference there has been an expanding exchange of information among nations. My Government is gratified to have been able to distribute technical libraries to more than 50 nations, libraries which are kept current by periodic supplements. Now let us recognize the full importance of these technical libraries. To a substantial degree they embrace the world's knowledge of the peaceful applications of atomic energy. A few years ago this knowledge was shrouded in military secrecy. These libraries are a specific expression of our preparedness freely to contribute to this worldwide exchange of information the technology developed through large expenditures of money and the talents of our scientists.

Mr. President, these collections of scientific information are as necessary to the achievement of progress in the peaceful applications of atomic energy as the materials made available to the Agency. They attest the desire of my Government to remove barriers to the exchange of scientific knowledge among nations. Without this, the mere exchange of material would be of little value.

There have been other accomplishments. Effective training programs have been established

by many countries, and we are happy to see that the benefits of these training programs are, to an ever increasing degree, being made available to students from other lands. The United States since 1953 has trained more than 600 technicians from abroad in reactor technology and in the use of radioactive isotopes.

In every place where industry, science, and education have laid their civilizing hands, there is the most lively interest in all phases of atomic inquiry. Research reactors and isotope laboratories are being installed throughout the world, and the people of my country are indeed glad to have been able to help other countries acquire these kinds of facilities. To bring this about, my Government has developed agreements of cooperation with 42 other nations to assist in the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Looking back on the past 4 years, we therefore see striking evidence of progress through cooperative efforts of nations throughout the world. And now we have the International Atomic Energy Agency in being. Already it has a substantial quantity of material at its disposal, and my Government earnestly hopes that, as more is needed, all member nations capable of helping will rise to the need. Our Agency has the nucleus of a splendid staff, which has shown impressive *esprit de corps*.

Finally, Mr. President, there has been recommended to us by the Preparatory Commission and the Board of Governors a program of work for the Agency's first year which, if carried forward vigorously, will be a creditable beginning.

Direction and Pace of Agency's Work

I turn now to a few comments concerning the direction and pace of the Agency's work. In doing this I should like to look beyond the work program which has been recommended to us for our first year, although I shall do no more than suggest what we may expect.

Scientific and technological progress is so rapid that what we predict today may later prove less than what we actually accomplish tomorrow. For example, my Government has recently announced that it plans shortly to operate one of its large materials-testing reactors solely on plutonium fuel. In addition, work has been under way for some time on a reactor designed to use the plutonium-recycle concept. Experience gained

³ *Ibid.*, Sept. 5, 1955, p. 381, and Oct. 10, 1955, p. 555.

in these operations could have far-reaching effects on the future of reactor design and on the economy of electricity from atomic power plants. Thus, plutonium—the byproduct of reactor operation and now used mainly in weapons—would take its place along with uranium 235 as a material which can be turned into electricity for an energy-hungry world.

For we must constantly bear in mind that electricity produced by atomic plants is a reality. Plants of present design can be safely and, in high-cost power areas, economically operated. Hundreds of atomic applications are working quiet revolutions in almost every phase of medicine, research, agriculture, and industry. Within one or two decades a considerable portion of the world's merchant fleets may be running on atomic power. Within 25 years more electricity may be produced, even in the highly industrialized areas of the world, by nuclear or thermonuclear power plants than is now being produced from coal, oil, and falling water.

The role that the Agency will play in the realization of these benefits and in the creation of new opportunities depends, we believe, chiefly on the support of its members and on the imagination and resourcefulness of its staff.

The statements made thus far in the general debate provide impressive evidence of the seriousness and sincerity with which some members approach their responsibilities to the Agency. A number of delegations have stated that they can now or will soon be in a position to make nuclear materials available in quantities substantial in relation to their capabilities. An even larger number have offered to the Agency facilities for use in research and for training this and the coming generation of scientists, engineers, and technicians.

On the other hand, several delegations have declared their interest in obtaining materials and in obtaining access to research and training facilities through the Agency. So we can see that the members are now thinking of the Agency in practical terms. And this means that the Agency must be prepared to get on with its job.

My Government is firmly committed to the principle that the pace of the Agency's progress should be as rapid as possible, within the limits of wisely conceived programs. The American people are united in support of this principle. We believe that the speed with which the Inter-

national Atomic Energy Agency acts to bring the constructive benefits of atomic energy to all peoples will influence the achievement of lasting peace. The bright promises of radiation and radioisotopes provide even nonindustrialized countries with opportunities for improvement in health and agriculture. On our part, the United States has accepted the great challenge to lessen poverty and distress among all peoples.

I am sure that all delegations share with mine an eagerness to tackle the challenging problems ahead. Likewise, I am sure we share the desire not only to complete the work of our organization as soon as possible but to build this structure so that the talents of our scientists, our engineers, our educators, our business and working men—indeed, all of our peoples—may be brought to bear on the problems which face us. In this connection, may I say, Mr. President, that the aims of this Agency are so broad that the talents and energy of many in all our member nations will be required if its ultimate purposes are to be achieved.

In conclusion, Mr. President, may I say that my Government believes that the peaceful uses of atomic energy may establish a new pattern in international relations—a pattern of reduced tension and better understanding as we all direct our diverse talents to a common subject and a common purpose. For, above all, the peaceful uses of atomic energy offer the world an opportunity to find a new means of communication—a common basis for expression and understanding which in time may extend to other international relationships—upon which mankind's ageless and eternal hopes for peace may come to secure rest.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

UNESCO Executive Board

The Department of State announced on November 5 (press release 616) that the U.S. Government will be represented by the following delegation at the meeting of the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which will meet at Paris for its 49th session, November 18–December 6, 1957.

United States Representative
Athelstan Spilhaus

Advisers

Henry J. Kellermann, Counselor for UNESCO Affairs,
American Embassy, Paris

Max McCullough, UNESCO Relations Staff, Department
of State

James Simsarian, Office of International Economic and
Social Affairs, Department of State

At this session, the Executive Board will discuss the Director General's report on UNESCO's activities from January 1-June 30, 1957, as well as reports on the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and on the activities of member states in UNESCO.

The Executive Board will also consider a report of the working party established at its 47th session to study methods for the preparation of the proposed program and budget for 1959-1960 and the organization of the work of the 10th session of the General Conference of UNESCO, which is scheduled to be held at Paris in November 1958.

Further steps are expected to be taken at this session to insure close collaboration between UNESCO and the International Atomic Energy Agency, as well as with the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

TREATY INFORMATION

**U.S. and Netherlands Exchange
Ratifications of Friendship Treaty**

Press release 613 dated November 5

Ratifications were exchanged at Washington on November 5 of the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States and the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The treaty was signed at The Hague on March 27, 1956.¹ It will by its terms enter into force one month from the date of exchange of ratifications. The Secretary of State and Ambassador van Roijen officiated at the exchange.

¹ BULLETIN of Apr. 9, 1956, p. 621.

The treaty, consisting of 27 articles, a protocol, and an exchange of notes, is similar to a number of other treaties concluded by the United States in recent years. Its principal purpose is to establish a comprehensive legal basis for the growth of investment, general business, and other relations between the two countries. It supersedes a more limited treaty of commerce and navigation signed August 26, 1852.

On the date of the exchange of ratification the Government of the Netherlands presented a note informing the U.S. Government of the extension of the treaty to the Netherlands Antilles, a possibility provided for in article XXIV of the treaty.

**Educational Exchange Agreement
With Brazil**

Press release 618 dated November 6

The Governments of Brazil and the United States on November 5 signed an agreement putting into operation a new program of educational exchanges authorized by the Fulbright act. The signing took place at Rio de Janeiro with José Carlos Macedo Soares, Brazilian Minister of Foreign Affairs, representing his Government and Ambassador Ellis O. Briggs representing the Government of the United States.

The agreement provides for the expenditure of Brazilian currency equivalent to \$980,000 received from the sale of surplus agricultural products in Brazil to finance exchanges of persons between the two countries to study, do research, teach, or engage in other educational activities. The purpose of the program is to further the mutual understanding between the peoples of Brazil and the United States through a wider exchange of knowledge and professional skills.

Under the terms of the agreement a binational commission to be known as the United States of America Educational Commission in Brazil will be established in Rio de Janeiro to facilitate the administration of the program. The Commission's board of directors will consist of 10 members with equal representation as to Brazilian and U.S. citizens in addition to the U.S. Ambassador, who will serve as honorary chairman. All recipients of awards under the program authorized by the Fulbright act are se-

lected by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, whose members are appointed by the President of the United States. The Board maintains a secretariat in the Department of State. Exchanges of persons under the Fulbright act are carried out as a regular part of the International Educational Exchange Program of the Department of State.

With the signing of this agreement Brazil becomes the 39th country and the 7th in Latin America to participate in the educational exchange program initiated 10 years ago under authority of the Fulbright act. Educational exchanges have been carried out for a number of years between Brazil and the United States under the Act of Cooperation between the American Republics, the Smith-Mundt act, and other legislation. This agreement will considerably augment the present number of exchanges.

After the members of the Commission have been appointed and a program has been formulated, information about specific opportunities to participate in the exchange activities will be released. It is anticipated that the Brazilian equivalent of approximately \$400,000 will be spent on the program during the first year.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Atomic Energy

Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Done at New York October 26, 1956. Entered into force July 29, 1957. TIAS 3873.

Ratification deposited (with reservation): Argentina, October 3, 1957.

Automotive Traffic

Convention on road traffic, with annexes. Done at Geneva September 19, 1949. Entered into force March 26, 1952. TIAS 2487.

Ratification deposited (with reservations and declarations): United Kingdom, July 8, 1957.

Protocol providing for accession to the convention on road traffic by occupied countries or territories. Done at Geneva September 19, 1949. TIAS 2487.

Ratification deposited: United Kingdom, July 8, 1957.

Cultural Relations

Convention for the promotion of inter-American cultural relations. Signed at Caracas March 28, 1954. Entered into force February 18, 1955; for the United States October 3, 1957.

Proclaimed by the President: November 5, 1957.

Postal Services

Convention of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain, final protocol, and regulations of execution.

November 25, 1957

Signed at Bogotá November 9, 1955. Entered into force March 1, 1956. TIAS 3653.

Ratification deposited: Paraguay, October 16, 1957.

Agreement relative to parcel post, final protocol, and regulations of execution of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain. Signed at Bogotá November 9, 1955. Entered into force March 1, 1956. TIAS 3654.

Ratification deposited: Paraguay, October 16, 1957.

Agreement relative to money orders and final protocol of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain. Signed at Bogotá November 9, 1955. Entered into force March 1, 1956. TIAS 3655.

Ratification deposited: Paraguay, October 16, 1957.

Sugar

Protocol amending the international sugar agreement (TIAS 3177), with annex. Done at London December 1, 1956. Entered into force January 1, 1957; for the United States September 25, 1957.

Proclaimed by the President: November 5, 1957.

War

Geneva convention relative to treatment of prisoners of war;

Geneva convention for amelioration of condition of wounded and sick in armed forces in the field;

Geneva convention for amelioration of condition of wounded, sick and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea;

Geneva convention relative to protection of civilian persons in time of war.

Dated at Geneva August 12, 1949. Entered into force October 21, 1950; for the United States February 2, 1956. TIAS 3364, 3362, 3363, and 3365, respectively.

Adherences deposited: Democratic Republic of Germany (with reservations), November 30, 1956; Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam (with reservations), June 28, 1957; People's Democratic Republic of Korea (with reservations), August 27, 1957; Sudan, September 23, 1957.

Ratifications deposited: People's Republic of China (with reservations), December 28, 1956; United Kingdom (with a declaration), September 23, 1957.

BILATERAL

Brazil

Agreement for financing certain educational exchange programs. Effected by exchange of notes at Rio de Janeiro November 5, 1957. Entered into force November 5, 1957.

Burma

Economic cooperation agreement. Signed at Rangoon March 21, 1957. Entered into force October 9, 1957 (date of notification by Burma that necessary legal requirements had been fulfilled).

Netherlands

Treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation, with protocol and exchange of notes. Signed at The Hague, March 27, 1956.

Ratifications exchanged: November 5, 1957.

Enters into force: December 5, 1957.

Pakistan

Agreement amending the agreement of February 12 and May 1, 1954 (TIAS 3088) relating to an informational media guaranty program. Effected by exchange of notes at Karachi January 1 and 8, 1957. Entered into force January 8, 1957.

United Kingdom

Agreement supplementing the agreement of November 1, 1956, for the establishment in Barbados of an ocean-

ographic research station (TIAS 3672). Effected by exchange of notes at Washington October 30, 1957. Entered into force October 30, 1957.

Viet-Nam

Agreement relating to investment guaranties under section 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 832, 847; 22 U.S.C. 1933). Effected by exchange of notes at Washington November 5, 1957. Entered into force November 5, 1957.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Appointments

Philip K. Crowe as Special Assistant to the Secretary, effective November 4. (For biographic details, see press release 615 dated November 5.)

Designations

Elbert G. Mathews as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Planning, effective November 4.

Joseph S. Henderson as Director, Visa Office, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, effective November 7. (For biographic details, see press release 622 dated November 8.)

PUBLICATIONS

Report on Mutual Security Program Sent to Congress

Following is the text of a letter from the President transmitting the report to Congress on the mutual security program for the 6 months ended June 30, 1957.¹

To the Congress of the United States: I am transmitting herewith the Twelfth Semiannual Report on the operations of the Mutual Security

¹H. Doc. 243, 85th Cong., 1st sess.; transmitted Oct. 23. Copies of the report may be obtained from the Office of Public Reports, International Cooperation Administration, Washington 25, D.C. For excerpts from the report for the period July 1-Dec. 31, 1956, see BULLETIN of June 10, 1957, p. 931.

Program for the period January 1 through June 30, 1957.

During this time we have seen repeated evidence of the need for, and the results attained from, each of the major elements of our free world partnership for mutual security. Through our contribution toward strong defense, we help make military attack less likely. Through programs of economic development and technical cooperation, we help the people in less developed areas of the free world to improve their living standards. Through emergency programs, undertaken to relieve human misery resulting from disaster, we live up to the best in our heritage of concern for our fellowman.

The Mutual Security Program carried out in concert with other free nations, remains a vital and proven instrument for advancing the security and economic progress both of our own nation and of our partners in the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE,
October 23, 1957.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: November 4-10

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Press releases issued prior to November 4 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 598 of October 28, 602 of October 29, and 606 of October 31.

No.	Date	Subject
609	11/4	Berding: "UNESCO: One Road to Peace."
610	11/4	King of Morocco to visit U.S. (rewrite).
611	11/4	O'Connor: remarks on arrival of Korean refugee.
612	11/4	McCollum: remarks on arrival of Korean refugee.
613	11/5	Treaty of friendship with the Netherlands.
614	11/5	Jones: "United States Policy in the Far East."
*615	11/5	Crowe appointed special assistant to Secretary (biographic details).
616	11/5	Delegation to UNESCO Executive Board (rewrite).
617	11/5	Dulles: news conference.
618	11/6	U.S.-Brazil educational exchange agreement.
619	11/6	Herter: "New Dimensions in Diplomacy."
620	11/8	Renegotiation of tariff concessions.
†621	11/7	Dillon: Western States Council.
*622	11/8	Henderson appointed director of Visa Office (biographic details).

*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

June
evi-
ined
free
ough
help
pro-
ical
oped
ing
un-
rom
e of
t in
ital
ecu-
na-
R
a
r
t
in
in

November 25, 1957

Index

Vol. XXXVII, No. 961

Asia	
New Dimensions in Diplomacy (Herter)	831
United States Policy in the Far East (Jones)	840
Atomic Energy. Using Atomic Energy for the Benefit of Mankind (McKinney)	857
Aviation. Civil Aviation Discussions With Scandinavian Countries	846
Brazil. Educational Exchange Agreement With Brazil	860
Canada. Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Five Countries	850
Ceylon. Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Five Countries	850
Communism. United States Policy in the Far East (Jones)	840
Congress, The. Report on Mutual Security Program Sent to Congress (Eisenhower)	862
Denmark. Civil Aviation Discussions With Scandinavian Countries	846
Department and Foreign Service	
Appointments (Crowe)	862
Designations (Henderson, Mathews)	862
Disarmament. Secretary Dulles' New Conference of November 5	824
Economic Affairs	
GATT Amendments Become Effective	849
President Places Tariff Quota on Almond Imports (text of proclamation)	852
Progress Under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (Mann, Eisenhower)	846
Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Five Countries	850
Tariff Commission's Report on Dried Figs and Fig Paste	853
World Bank Reports Net Income of \$10.1 Million for Quarter	853
Educational Exchange	
Educational Exchange Agreement With Brazil	860
New Dimensions in Diplomacy (Herter)	831
UNESCO: One Road to Peace (Berding)	835
Finland. Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Five Countries	850
Greece. Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Five Countries	850
International Information	
New Dimensions in Diplomacy (Herter)	831
UNESCO: One Road to Peace (Berding)	835
International Organizations and Conferences	
Progress Under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (Mann, Eisenhower)	846
UNESCO Executive Board (delegation)	859
Using Atomic Energy for the Benefit of Mankind (McKinney)	857
Japan. United States Policy in the Far East (Jones)	840
Korea	
First Refugee From Far East Arrives in U.S. Under New Law (McCollum, O'Connor)	845
Question of Admission of Korea and Viet-Nam to Membership in the United Nations (Washington)	854
Military Affairs. Science in National Security (Eisenhower)	819

Morocco. Mohammed V, King of Morocco, To Visit United States	846
Mutual Security. Report on Mutual Security Program Sent to Congress (Eisenhower)	862
Netherlands. U.S. and Netherlands Exchange Ratifications of Friendship Treaty	860
North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Secretary Dulles' News Conference of November 5	824
Norway. Civil Aviation Discussions With Scandinavian Countries	846
Presidential Documents	
President Places Tariff Quota on Almond Imports	852
Progress Under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (text of message)	846
Report on Mutual Security Program Sent to Congress	862
Science in National Security	819
Publications. Report on Mutual Security Program Sent to Congress (Eisenhower)	862
Refugees. First Refugee From Far East Arrives in U.S. Under New Law (McCollum, O'Connor)	845
Science	
Science in National Security (Eisenhower)	819
Secretary Dulles' News Conference of November 5	824
Sweden. Civil Aviation Discussions With Scandinavian Countries	846
Treaty Information	
Civil Aviation Discussions With Scandinavian Countries	846
Current Actions	861
Educational Exchange Agreement With Brazil	860
U.S. and Netherlands Exchange Ratifications of Friendship Treaty	860
Union of South Africa. Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Five Countries	850
U.S.S.R.	
Question of Admission of Korea and Viet-Nam to Membership in the United Nations (Washington)	854
Secretary Dulles' News Conference of November 5	824
United Nations	
New Dimensions in Diplomacy (Herter)	831
Question of Admission of Korea and Viet-Nam to Membership in the United Nations (Washington)	854
UNESCO: One Road to Peace (Berding)	835
Viet-Nam. Question of Admission of Korea and Viet-Nam to Membership in the United Nations (Washington)	854

Name Index

Berding, Andrew H	835
Crowe, Philip K	862
Dulles, Secretary	824
Eisenhower, President	819, 846, 852, 862
Henderson, Joseph S	862
Herter, Christian	831
Jones, Howard P	840
Mann, Thomas C	846
Mathews, Elbert G	862
McCollum, Robert	845
McKinney, Robert M	857
Mohammed V	846
O'Connor, Roderic	845
Washington, Genoa S	854

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)



the
Department
of
State

A new release in the popular *Background* series . . .

IRAQ

In the heart of the Middle East—the land bridge between Europe, Asia, and Africa—lies Iraq, a country of rich historical background and impressive potentialities.

The United States and Iraq formally established diplomatic relations in 1931. But American interest in Iraq, its history, and its people goes back to the last century, when American educational institutions organized the first U.S. archeological expedition in south-eastern Iraq in 1889.

Early in 1957 Iraq associated itself with the American Doctrine for the Middle East, whose principal aim is to help the states of that area maintain their freedom and national independence.

A new *Background* publication discusses Iraq's history and its plans for development. Sections of the 15-page illustrated pamphlet deal with

The Land and the People
Historical Development
The Government
The Economy
Work of the Development Board
U.S. Technical Assistance
Iraq in International Affairs

Copies of the publication may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at 15 cents each.

Publication 6514

15 cents

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed And:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or
money order).

Please send me . . . copies of *Iraq*.

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

